

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued Mar. 19, 1953
For actions of Mar. 18, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 47

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....9	Leave.....6	Pricing.....12,17
Alaska.....31	Library services.....14	Reorganization.....10,25,29
Crop insurance.....13	Loans, farm.....16,22	R.E.A.....2
Dairy industry.....26	Missouri Basin.....4	St. Lawrence seaway.....27
Economic advisers.....1	Monopolies.....11	Small business.....23
Electrification.....2,19	Nominations.....1,28	Soil conservation.....4
Expenditures.....5	Personnel.....1,5,6,21,28	Surplus com- modities.....6,15,20
Farm programs.....8	Potatoes.....30	Tobacco.....18
Hawaii statehood.....7	Prices, farm.....24	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senators debated Wickard resignation. Senate confirmed nominations of Burns to Council of Economic Advisers and Young to Civil Service Commission. Sen. Humphrey urged distribution of surplus commodities for foreign relief. House passed FSA reorganization measure. Rep. Whitten discussed falling farm prices and favored price supports. Sen. Mundt introduced bill to distribute surplus commodities for foreign relief, and he and others discussed measure. Sen. Aiken introduced and discussed bill to extend and expand crop insurance program. Rep. Poage introduced bill to authorize sale of surplus commodities to Korea.

SENATE

1. NOMINATIONS of Arthur F. Burns to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers and Philip Young to be a member of the Civil Service Commission were confirmed (pp. 2155-7).
2. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. Sens. Hill, Kefauver, McNamara, and Humphrey criticized the "forced resignation" of Claude Wickard as REA Administrator, and Sens. Dworshak and Welker debated this matter with them (pp. 2146-8, 2150-2).
3. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Sen. Humphrey spoke in favor of distribution of surplus commodities for foreign relief (pp. 2157-8).
4. MISSOURI BASIN. Received a Nebr. Legislature resolution favoring development of soil conservation, etc., in this Basin (p. 2115).
5. EXPENDITURES; PERSONNEL. Sen. Byrd inserted a report by the Joint Committee on Unessential Federal Expenditures regarding personnel and unexpended balances (pp. 2120-3).
6. PERSONNEL. Sen. Johnston inserted his correspondence with GAO on the incident whereby ORS employees collected terminal leave and were reappointed (pp. 2130-1).

Sen. Johnston requested that the reports of the Subcommittee on Federal

Manpower Policies be printed as Senate documents, but Sen. Taft asked that the matter go over until Fri. (pp. 2131-2).

7. HAWAII STATEHOOD. Sen. Robertson spoke against statehood for Hawaii (pp. 2132-4).

8. FARM PROGRAMS. The Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee announced hearings as follows: Mar. 23-4, continuation of the Mexican farm labor program; Mar. 25, to hear Secretary Benson "review actions taken by his Department to date"; and beginning Apr. 7, agricultural imports and exports and their effect on farm-price programs (p. D169).

9. ADJOURNED until Fri., Mar. 20 (p. 2164).

HOUSE

10. REORGANIZATION. Passed, 291-85, with a clarifying amendment H. J. Res. 223, providing that Reorganization Plan No. 1, creating a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, take effect 10 days after enactment of the joint resolution (pp. 2167-93).

11. MONOPOLIES. The Antitrust Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee approved for reporting to the full committee H. R. 2237, to increase fines under the Sherman Antitrust Act from \$5,000 to \$50,000 (p. D172).

BILLS INTRODUCED

12. PRICING. S. 1357, by Sen. Kefauver (for himself and others), to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act; to Judiciary Committee (p. 2124). Remarks of author (pp. 2125-6).

13. CROP INSURANCE. S. 1367, by Sen. Aiken (for himself and Sen. Young), to extend for 4 years the authority to expand the crop-insurance program into additional counties; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 2124). Remarks of author (p. 2126).

14. LIBRARY SERVICES. S. 1368, by Sen. Aiken (for himself and others), to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee (p. 2124).

15. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. S. 1369, by Sen. Mundt (for himself and others), to establish a Foreign Trading Division in the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to promote the disposal in foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (pp. 2124-5). Remarks of author (pp. 2137-41).

16. FARM LOANS. S. 1371, by Sen. Magnuson, to extend for 5 years the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans for the purpose of making available in any area or region credit formerly made available in such area or region by RACC; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 2125).

17. PRICING. S. 1377, by Sen. Capehart (for himself and Sen. Johnson, Colo.), to define the application of the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts to certain pricing practices; to Judiciary Committee (p. 2125). Remarks of author (p. 2128).

S. 1369

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 18, 1953

Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. SCHOEPP) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To establish a Foreign Trading Division in the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to promote the disposal in foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is
4 amended by inserting after section 10 thereof a new section
5 as follows:

6 “SEC. 10A. FOREIGN TRADING DIVISION.—(a) Within
7 the Corporation there shall be a Foreign Trading Division,
8 which shall be headed by a vice president of the Corporation
9 to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. All of the

1 powers and duties of the Corporation relating to foreign
2 trade shall be exercised by the Foreign Trading Division,
3 subject to the supervision and control of the Board. The
4 provisions of this section shall not affect the responsibility of
5 the Board for the management of the activities of the Corpora-
6 tion relating to foreign trade or otherwise affect the authority
7 of the Board or of the Secretary, other than the authority
8 with respect to the delegation of the powers vested in the
9 Corporation relating to foreign trade.

10 “(b) (1) Within the Foreign Trading Division, there
11 shall be a Foreign Trading Advisory Council which shall
12 consist of a representative of the Department of State, to be
13 appointed by the Secretary of State; a representative of the
14 Department of Defense, to be appointed by the Secretary of
15 Defense; a representative of the Department of Agriculture,
16 to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture; and a
17 representative of the Department of Commerce, to be ap-
18 pointed by the Secretary of Commerce. It shall be the duty
19 of the Advisory Council to survey the policies of the Foreign
20 Trading Division and the policies of the Board with respect
21 to matters relating to foreign trade, and to make such recom-
22 mendations to the Foreign Trading Division and to the
23 Board as it deems advisable.

24 “(2) Members of the Advisory Council shall receive
25 compensation of \$50 per day for each day they are engaged

1 in performing their duties, except that any such member
2 who is also an officer or employee of the United States shall
3 not receive any compensation in addition to his compensa-
4 tion as such officer or employee. All members of the Ad-
5 visory Council shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary
6 traveling expenses incurred in the performance of their
7 duties.

8 “(3) The Corporation shall furnish to the Advisory
9 Council such technical and clerical assistance as may be nec-
10 essary to enable it to perform the duties imposed upon it by
11 this subsection.

12 “(c) (1) In addition to the powers conferred upon the
13 Corporation by sections 4 and 5 of this Act, the Corporation
14 shall have power to remove and dispose of, or aid in the
15 removal or disposition of, surplus agricultural commodities by
16 selling, trading, or bartering in or to a foreign country such
17 surplus agricultural commodities and accepting in exchange
18 therefor—

19 “(A) any agricultural product of such foreign coun-
20 try (or any agricultural product of any other foreign
21 country which is available in such foreign country)
22 which is not competitive with domestic agricultural com-
23 modities, or with respect to which the domestic produc-
24 tion of competitive domestic agricultural commodities
25 is insufficient to meet domestic demand;

1 “(B) any nonagricultural product of such foreign
2 country (or any nonagricultural product of any other
3 foreign country which is available in such foreign
4 country) which is not competitive with domestic prod-
5 ucts, or with respect to which the domestic production
6 of competitive products is insufficient to meet domestic
7 demand; or

8 “(C) any product of such foreign country (or any
9 product of any other foreign country which is available
10 in such foreign country) which is needed by the United
11 States for military or defense purposes or of value in
12 developing our atomic energy program.

13 “(2) The Corporation shall also have power to sell in
14 a foreign country any product acquired by it under clauses
15 (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection and to
16 accept in exchange therefor any product of such foreign
17 country (or any product of any other foreign country which
18 is available in such foreign country) which it has power to
19 acquire in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities
20 under the authority of paragraph (1).

21 “(3) In exercising its powers under this subsection, the
22 Corporation shall give priority to acquiring products de-
23 scribed in paragraph (1) (C) of this subsection.

24 “(d) In exercising its powers under subsection (c), the
25 Corporation shall, insofar as practicable, utilize the usual and

1 customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and
2 commerce. In making the semiannual reports required by
3 subsection (g), the Corporation shall enumerate all trans-
4 actions made under authority of subsection (c) in which the
5 usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements
6 of trade and commerce were not used.

7 “(e) The Corporation may exercise the powers con-
8 ferred upon it by subsection (c) to acquire strategic and
9 critical materials, but any strategic and critical materials so
10 acquired shall be disposed of in the manner provided in
11 section 4 (h) of this Act.

12 “(f) To enable the Corporation to exercise the powers
13 conferred upon it by this section, not less than \$500,000,000
14 of the funds available to the Corporation shall be available
15 solely for the use of the Foreign Trading Division.

16 “(g) The Corporation shall, six months after the date
17 of enactment of this section and at the end of each six-month
18 period thereafter, submit a complete report of the activities
19 of the Foreign Trading Division during the preceding six-
20 month period to the Senate and the House of Representa-
21 tives. If the Congress is not in session at the time for
22 submission of any such report, such report shall be submitted
23 to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House
24 of Representatives for transmission to the Senate and House,
25 respectively, at the commencement of their next session.”

A BILL

To establish a Foreign Trading Division in the
Commodity Credit Corporation in order to
promote the disposal in foreign countries of
surplus agricultural commodities.

By Mr. MUNDT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CASE, Mr.
CLEMENTS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina,
Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL

MARCH 18, 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply wish to say that I am glad to join with the Senator from Florida in offering the resolution. In the State of Massachusetts, I think there are more mental hospitals and more psychiatric clinics than in almost any other State in the Union, and we realize their importance. I commend the Senator from Florida for the statement he has made and the action he has taken.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

THE PROBLEM OF AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the field of mutual security aid to our allies abroad, we hear much these days of the phrase "trade, not aid." I shall address myself briefly to a suggestion that the phrase be revised somewhat as it is applied to problems of American agriculture, and that we consider using the phrase "trade to aid."

It seems to me that it has become clear to all citizens that, from the standpoint of maintaining parity prices for products which are raised in surplus in this country, the crux of the problem which we confront is to find consumers abroad or at home who are able to pay for surplus products prices which will enable the Government to dispose of them without suffering or incurring any serious loss. I propose that we expand our foreign trade in farm products by exporting foods and fabrics so as to aid our foreign friends as well as our American farmers.

The problem of agricultural surpluses has been dramatized by such efforts to support prices as those undertaken by the previous administration in connection with potatoes, eggs, and certain other products. The situation has been further dramatized by problems confronting the present administration with respect to price supports for butter, cotton, and other products which are raised in surplus in this country.

In an effort to grapple with this particular problem, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], I now introduce for appropriate reference a bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1369) to establish a Foreign Trading Division in the Commodity Credit Corporation in order to promote the disposal in foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities, introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I also ask, because the bill is brief, that the full text of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended by inserting after section 10 thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 10A. Foreign Trading Division: (a) Within the Corporation there shall be a Foreign Trading Division, which shall be headed by a Vice President of the Corporation to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture. All of the powers and duties of the Corporation relating to foreign trade shall be exercised by the Foreign Trading Division, subject to the supervision and control of the Board. The provisions of this section shall not affect the responsibility of the Board for the management of the activities of the Corporation relating to foreign trade or otherwise affect the authority of the Board or of the Secretary, other than the authority with respect to the delegation of the powers vested in the Corporation relating to foreign trade.

"(b) (1) Within the Foreign Trading Division, there shall be a Foreign Trading Advisory Council which shall consist of a representative of the Department of State, to be appointed by the Secretary of State; a representative of the Department of Defense, to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense; a representative of the Department of Agriculture, to be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture; and a representative of the Department of Commerce, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce. It shall be the duty of the Advisory Council to survey the policies of the Foreign Trading Division and the policies of the Board with respect to matters relating to foreign trade, and to make such recommendations to the Foreign Trading Division and to the Board as it deems advisable.

"(2) Members of the Advisory Council shall receive compensation of \$50 per day for each day they are engaged in performing their duties, except that any such member who is also an officer or employee of the United States shall not receive any compensation in addition to his compensation as such officer or employee. All members of the Advisory Council shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary traveling expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

"(3) The Corporation shall furnish to the Advisory Council such technical and clerical assistance as may be necessary to enable it to perform the duties imposed upon it by this subsection.

"(c) (1) In addition to the powers conferred upon the Corporation by sections 4 and 5 of this act, the Corporation shall have power to remove and dispose of, or aid in the removal or disposition of, surplus agricultural commodities by selling, trading, or bartering in or to a foreign country such surplus agricultural commodities and accepting in exchange therefor—

"(A) any agricultural product of such foreign country (or any agricultural product of any other foreign country which is available in such foreign country) which is not competitive with domestic agricultural commodities, or with respect to which the domestic production of competitive domestic agricultural commodities is insufficient to meet domestic demand;

"(B) any nonagricultural product of such foreign country (or any nonagricultural product of any other foreign country which is available in such foreign country) which is not competitive with domestic products, or with respect to which the domestic production of competitive products is insufficient to meet domestic demand; or

"(C) any product of such foreign country (or any product of any other foreign country which is available in such foreign country) which is needed by the United States for military or defense purposes or of value in developing our atomic energy program.

"(2) The Corporation shall also have power to sell in a foreign country any product

acquired by it under clauses (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection and to accept in exchange therefor any product of such foreign country (or any product of any other foreign country which is available in such foreign country) which it has power to acquire in exchange for surplus agricultural commodities under the authority of paragraph (1).

"(3) In exercising its powers under this subsection, the Corporation shall give priority to acquiring products described in paragraph (1) (C) of this subsection.

"(d) In exercising its powers under subsection (c), the Corporation shall, insofar as practicable, utilize the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce. In making the semi-annual reports required by subsection (g), the Corporation shall enumerate all transactions made under authority of subsection (c) in which the usual and customary channels, facilities, and arrangements of trade and commerce were not used.

"(e) The Corporation may exercise the powers conferred upon it by subsection (c) to acquire strategic and critical materials, but any strategic and critical materials so acquired shall be disposed of in the manner provided in section 4 (h) of this act.

"(f) To enable the Corporation to exercise the powers conferred upon it by this section, not less than \$500 million of the funds available to the Corporation shall be available solely for the use of the Foreign Trading Division.

"(g) The Corporation shall, 6 months after the date of enactment of this section and at the end of each 6-month period thereafter, submit a complete report of the activities of the Foreign Trading Division during the preceding 6-month period to the Senate and the House of Representatives. If the Congress is not in session at the time for submission of any such report, such report shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives for transmission to the Senate and House, respectively, at the commencement of their next session."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I invite the attention of our friends in the Press Gallery to the fact that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] called my office after I had made some brief discussion of the proposed legislation in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, which met this morning. The Senator from Kentucky asked that his name be associated with that of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from South Dakota. For that reason his name did not appear in the news release which dealt with this particular legislation.

In short, we propose in the bill which has just been sent to the desk to create within the boundaries and the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation a separate section to be known as the Foreign Trading Division. It is our thought that this Foreign Trading Division should be able to provide the Government leadership and activity which is necessary in order to stimulate the movement of foods and fabrics raised in this country in excess, into the hands of those who need them and are able to pay for them, either with currency of their own nationality or with products which they have in abundance, and which we can use in this country.

Members of the Senate and the people of the country generally are well aware of the fact that many different formulas

have been suggested for dealing with the problem of putting into use and consuming agricultural surpluses which have tended to accumulate or which have come into the hands of the Government as a result of the price-support program.

We had before us for general discussion a year or two ago a proposal called the Brannan plan. The Brannan plan was carefully studied by the Agriculture Committees of both Houses. It was a proposal which would have subsidized American consumers by having the Federal Government pick up the check for a part of the grocery bill paid by every American family, whether it was a rich family or a poor family. It was an effort, of course, to do something about the agricultural surpluses, but, on balance, it was generally conceded by those who studied the legislation that it was an unwise experiment and that it would not only cost the American taxpayer a tremendous amount of money, but would also eventually prove injurious to the American farmer. So, in my opinion, the Brannan plan was wisely abandoned, and we have continued to look for other methods and other procedures to make available to those who need them American foods and fabrics which we can produce in such abundance in this country provided the farmer is paid a fair and adequate price for his efforts.

Another approach in this same direction has been the school-lunch program, which, so far as it operates to provide needy children with the proper well-balanced diet, meets the problem of malnutrition and contributes to the national health, certainly serves a useful purpose, but it has only limited practical possibilities.

However, with the many millions of people around the globe who are suffering from malnutrition and from lack of proper food and adequate clothing, it seems to me that the problem we confront is largely to find an answer to the question of how to place in the hands of those people who need our foods and fabrics the products of the American farm.

The problem is how to place such products in the hands of foreign countries in such a way that they, in turn, can pay for them, so that the American farmer can receive for his products the full parity price or the honest cost of production plus a reasonable profit, to which he is entitled.

The proposed legislation, with respect to which I have been joined as a sponsor by the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Kentucky tackles the specific problem confronting us, which we recognize to be a substantial problem. We do not contend that it would prove a cure-all for all the problems involving agriculture and agricultural surpluses, but we honestly believe that it would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota that after the meeting of the Senate Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry today the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] stated that he would like to have the privilege of being associated with the Senator from South Dakota in the sponsorship of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as one of the sponsors of the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to have him join us. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] made a similar request after the bill had been briefly reviewed before our committee this morning.

In brief, our bill proposes to set aside from the funds now available to the Commodity Credit Corporation an initial fund of \$500 million. With that fund of \$500 million the proposed legislation would convey to the Commodity Credit Corporation some authorities which do not now exist in the field of foreign trade. It would provide the Commodity Credit Corporation with the authority, under the express direction of Congress, to move into the field of international trade from the standpoint of agricultural products which are raised in surplus quantities in the United States.

The bill would give the Commodity Credit Corporation the authority to purchase in the open market, or to take the products which come into its possession through the operation of the farm-support program, and go abroad actively seeking markets in which such products could be sold. It would give the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to take the products which come into its possession by one device or another, and sell them abroad, if they can be sold, for the native currency within the given country. In turn, the Commodity Credit Corporation could use such currency to purchase products which are in demand in this country, and which are not raised on our farms or fabricated in our factories in quantities adequate to supply our domestic demands.

The bill would go further and provide the Commodity Credit Corporation with authority to make trades, to barter, and to make exchanges with people in foreign countries, so that the products which we have to make available to them could be exchanged or bartered for products which we need, and which, in turn, are not raised, produced, or fabricated in this country in quantities sufficient to meet our domestic demands.

The only respect in which the bill would convey authority to import products which would compete with the products of this country which are not in short supply would be in two specific fields—first, in the field of national defense, in which the Commodity Credit Corporation would be directed by Congress to exercise its authority to make what trades it can for strategic materials to be stockpiled for war supplies which are needed, in exchange for agricultural products. The same authority and direction are incorporated in the legislation from the standpoint of any material useful in the development of our atomic energy program, so that the products which we raise can be exchanged for foreign products raised on the farm, for foreign products which are fabricated, processed, mined, or produced

abroad, and which are not produced in this country in quantities sufficient to meet our demands. In addition there would be authority to barter or exchange for products essential to our national defense for stockpiling purposes, and for the development of our atomic energy program.

It should be called to the attention of the country that in a great many cases the problem is not simply one of making a bilateral trade agreement whereby the United States is able to trade with foreign country X, Y, or Z, for some specific product which we need. The Commodity Credit Corporation, through the Foreign Trading Division, would be expected to negotiate multilateral trading agreements when necessary, and to make trades in which perhaps four or five countries would be involved, in a process in which eventually the product of the American farm, produced for the American consumer, would be exchanged for some foreign product which the American consumer desires and needs, and for which he is willing to pay ready cash.

From the standpoint of the utilization of foreign currency, the difficulties confronting us arise because of the monetary differences between countries, the lack of interchangeability, and the fact that the world is divided into two monetary areas, in the main, namely, the dollar area and the sterling area. All this contributes to the stifling and stultification of the international trade.

That has become a special problem in the field of agriculture. The proposed legislation would give the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to utilize not only the products, but the money it obtains in such multilateral exchanges to purchase eventually for us products which we need and desire.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very glad to say that I am happy to join with the Senator from South Dakota in this legislative proposal. As a matter of fact, I have had a little experience in that field in attempting to arrange barter. On one occasion, at a time when the then Secretary of Agriculture was as well chairman of the Combined Food Board, which was allocating food all over the world, a representative of the Government of India came to the Department of Agriculture. He wanted wheat desperately for the people of his country. India did not have the dollars, but he still felt that the wheat should be available. I reminded him that the Cuban people were objecting to the fact that his country was not selling them the proper quantity of bags in which to pack their sugar. I also reminded him that the Cuban people were not supplying this country with sufficient sugar for the summer canning program of our women. We called the Cuban Ambassador and arranged a three-way trade in which dollars were never mentioned. We shipped to India a number of tons of wheat, India shipped to Cuba a number of bags for carrying sugar, and Cuba

shipped to the United States the sugar necessary for the canning program.

I can say that it was all worked out in our minds on the basis of dollars, but it was purely a barter arrangement, which would be very difficult under any other sort of program.

The Senator from South Dakota has called attention to atomic-energy projects. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I recall at one time we were greatly concerned about getting certain products from specific areas. The situation was such that it was not desirable to name the specific products we wanted. We wanted to arrange a transfer of some kind. I am glad to note that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is present in the Chamber, because he was one who raised his voice in an attempt to have done what was necessary to be done. If there had been authority at that time to exchange wheat for the products we desired, the transaction could have been arranged in a simple manner. However, it was not done, and there was a great loss to this country. It could have been done readily if the necessary machinery had been available.

At one time an attempt was made by a previous Secretary of Agriculture to get the very type of authority provided in this proposed legislation. It was opposed by some persons who felt that we must never barter. However, we have seen recently situations in which barter is the only arrangement and the only device that can be used successfully.

I am glad that the Senator from South Dakota has presented a bill which would make such an arrangement possible.

I know that at one time the mills and mines in a portion of Germany over which the American flag was then flying needed additional supplies of wheat. The French were in great need of the products of the factories. At the same time the farmers in Italy were not able to operate their tractors because most of the tractors were not made in the United States but in European countries. By trading and trafficking and mixing back and forth the products of a host of establishments spare parts for the tractors of the Italian farmers were obtained, and in exchange goods came into the United States which were noncompetitive with American products.

That is against the law at the present time. The Commodity Credit Corporation is supposed to get dollars. It is only occasionally that a representative of the Department feels justified in trying to get something other than dollars and then he must be very sure of his ground. The proposed legislation would permit the Government to operate, and I think operate very successfully, in that way.

One final example, Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota will permit me to give it.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON. There was a time when the British Government, because of the austerity program, felt it necessary to cancel purchases of tobacco from the United States. A hoghead of tobacco which is packed in the United States for shipment to Britain is packed

in a different fashion than is the hoghead of tobacco shipped to other countries or used in the United States. The leaves are laid in a different manner. That is the way the British people want it. When the British Government closed down their tobacco buying programs because of the serious financial difficulty, tobacco farmers in certain States were worried. They thought there would be a tremendous addition to the surplus of tobacco, and there seemed to be no way of moving it.

That tobacco finally found itself in Spain. The Spanish tobacco monopoly is government owned. We were not at that time, as a government, dealing very much with Spain. However, it seemed to me that if the tobacco could be moved to England and then to Spain, it could also be moved directly to Spain. We could not get the dollars, which was the requirement. But the Spanish Government had great quantities of pesos on deposit with a New York bank. By pledging those pesos they were able to take the stock of tobacco and use it in their industry. We were able finally to provide payment in dollars over a long series of months. But the Treasury of the United States lost nothing, and the American farmers profited greatly, because that supply of tobacco did not hang over the market for a long time. We have a situation now in which great quantities of wheat are hanging over the market.

If the American farmer is to have a chance, that wheat ought to disappear from the market. It ought to be moved. I think it could be moved by barter. I do not think it can be moved by dollars.

That is why I am glad that the Senator has introduced the proposed legislation at this time. It will give a chance to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and his committee to take a good look at it and possibly make some suggestions which will eventually make it possible to move some of the surpluses before they become burdensome and difficult for the American farmer.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New Mexico very much for his valuable contribution to the debate. He has been very helpful in formalizing this particular piece of proposed legislation. It was largely brought about because of his experience in the field of agriculture, and his calling the specific situation to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which he is a very useful member.

There is nothing malicious or mischievous about a barter proposal. Ever since the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was fortunate enough to see the light of day in South Dakota, where he was born, he has lived, as I have lived, in what we call horse-trading country. A horse trade is a perfectly legitimate process of exchange. No one is cheated, and both sides are benefited. Perhaps we can apply that Yankee philosophy to these complicated problems of international trade.

I may point out that in this proposed legislation we specifically spell out that the Commodity Credit Corporation in

implementing it shall use the practicable and customary channels of trade.

Mr. President, this is not an effort to put the Government into business. It is an effort to get Government out of the stockpiling business and the warehousing business, and out of the activity of accumulating farm products, which are kept in storage until they deteriorate, and to use the values such products have abroad by either selling or exchanging them.

I may say that this proposed legislation provides an opportunity for dollars, pounds, francs, or any other form of currency to be used as a measuring device in evaluating the true worth of the various types of products and an opportunity for bringing about a meeting of minds, so that property of this kind can be exchanged, instead of having the various currencies, as they now operate, stand as guardians at the edge of the water or at the boundary line to keep various products away from the people who need them. I think we can have these currencies serve the mucilaginous purpose of bringing people and products together instead of keeping them apart, if we provide the Commodity Credit Corporation with the authority envisioned in this proposed legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield further.

Mr. ANDERSON. The question may arise on the part of the farmers: "Are you trying to take away \$500 million from the Commodity Credit Corporation and thereby harm its program?" Is it not true that the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation is nearly \$7 billion, as authorized by the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. And only a small portion of that amount would be utilized. Therefore, the \$500 million would not impair its capital or make it difficult for the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the farm program.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very happy the Senator from New Mexico has pointed that out. Nothing is further from my mind. This bill, if enacted, could not in any way impede the credit of the Commodity Credit Corporation; but enactment of the bill would provide an initial fund with which to begin, on an experimental basis, slowly, an effort to develop a formula by which to dispose of, in a useful manner, the products which we raise in such abundance in our country.

It is fair to expect that for a while the Commodity Credit Corporation would have some attrition of this fund; the Corporation might make some bad deals, and thus might reduce the \$500 million fund. On the other hand, the Corporation might make some good deals, and thus might increase the amount of the fund.

However, by proceeding slowly, the Corporation might very well develop some very desirable procedures, so that ultimately it would be possible for us to

help other countries get what they need, and at the same time help our own farmers obtain a permanent program which would maintain the prices of our agricultural products at the point where they deserve to be maintained, rather than to have unwanted surpluses stored in places where they would not be used.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from South Dakota suggests that in working out the proposed program, some bad deals might be made. However, is it not true that some bad deals occasionally are made in connection with the storage programs which cause the grain to hang over the market? Grain deteriorates and spoils in storage, and such spoilage and deterioration have cost the Government money.

Would not it be better to have the food consumed by people somewhere on the earth, rather than to have the food deteriorate and spoil while in storage?

Mr. MUNDT. I could not agree more completely with the Senator from New Mexico. Certainly a rather long and melancholy list of bad deals would have to be engaged in, one after another, before the use of the food for human consumption would cost more than the storage programs have actually cost. My recollection is that in the case of wheat alone, the International Wheat Agreement program cost the American taxpayers approximately \$200 million a year; and, of course, in connection with this matter we are dealing with all agricultural products.

Mr. President, perhaps this measure will also open up an avenue and will enable a formula to be provided by which to deal with the rather difficult category of perishable products, which cannot be stored, but have to be used, for the bill, when enacted, will enable us to purchase, trade, or exchange such products for things which will be useful and helpful to us. Perishables must be used promptly if loss is to be averted. Thus storage programs for perishables which fail to find early useage for the product are extremely expensive and have made it difficult to give producers of perishables the benefits of a price support program.

I shall be very happy to have, as I know the Senator from New Mexico will be, the thoughtful criticisms of our colleagues and also of persons throughout the Nation who may care to comment on this proposal. I expect to discuss it in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and tomorrow I expect to send a copy of the bill to our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, so that his experts may pick it full of holes, if they can, or make constructive suggestions, if they are available, and try to develop with us a program which over the long pull will shore up, bolster, and effectuate economies in our agricultural program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who, by the way, is a good Yankee horse trader.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from

South Dakota began his speech, and I regret that I have not had an opportunity to read his bill. Of course, I do not suppose it will be the entire answer to the problem.

Mr. MUNDT. Of course, it will not be.

Mr. AIKEN. However, I suppose enactment of the bill will be of help in answering the problem caused by our agricultural surpluses, both now and in the future.

Let me say that we have two major problems in connection with our agricultural program, as it relates to the other nations of the world. First of all because of the higher prices paid in the United States, there is a desire on the part of practically every major producer in the world, outside the United States, to sell its surplus agricultural products to the United States. In fact, other nations seem to have a desire to sell to us more than their surpluses, for they want dollars desperately, and today some of the other countries are engaging in the practice of dumping on the United States, in order to obtain dollars.

Mr. MUNDT. They also tamper with their own currencies, in order to undersell us in our own market.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. That occurs in the case of wool, for example.

Mr. AIKEN. When those countries are unloading those commodities in the United States, they are keeping them from other countries in the world which actually need them, whereas we in the United States do not need them at all.

Another major problem in connection with our agricultural program is that another group of nations would like to buy the surplus commodities of the United States, but simply do not have the dollars with which to do so. Therefore, in order to meet their particular problem, they are attempting to subsidize agricultural production in their own countries. They are subsidizing at a very high rate the production of agricultural commodities which we ourselves would like to sell to those countries, and which we would sell to them if some means were arranged whereby they could pay reasonable prices for them.

For instance, today Great Britain is subsidizing almost 45 percent of her food commodities, I believe; and other countries are similarly subsidizing the production of food commodities at costs in excess of what our surpluses would cost those countries, if some ways and means could be devised to meet the situation.

So I am glad the Senator from South Dakota has taken the step he has taken today. We shall receive the report of the Department of Agriculture on the bill as soon as possible. Of course, I do not know how long that will take. In the meantime, as the other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry know, in the committee we shall begin hearings immediately after Easter on the export and import situation in relation to farm commodities and the effect of that situation on the United States farm program.

I am glad that by means of the introduction of this bill—whether it is per-

fect or not; and probably it is not perfect, because very few bills are—

Mr. MUNDT. No claims for perfection are made for the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. At any rate, by means of the introduction of the bill, we shall be making a start toward solving what I believe to be the major agricultural problem not only in the United States, but in the entire world today.

At present we have in the United States what we call agricultural commodity surpluses. Actually, they are very small. For instance, we have 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 head of cattle more than we need, and that excess represents approximately 2-months' supply. We have 300 million bushels of wheat more than we need, and we have a few million pounds of butter more than we need.

However, those amounts are not surpluses, when we think in terms of world consumption; in that respect, they are not surpluses at all, for they could be used to alleviate the needs of other countries.

So I believe what the Senator from South Dakota has been referring to, and what he is making a start on today, may be the big agricultural problem which will come before this session of Congress. Certainly the solution he proposes is one which promises the greatest hope.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the chairman of my committee very much indeed for his intelligent commentary and for his encouraging remarks.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who is a new but very valuable member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has discussed a subject which I know is of tremendous interest to many farmers and many Members of Congress, including members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as we have to deal with the question of agricultural surpluses.

If the Senator from South Dakota will permit me to do so, at this time I should like to say that I shall be happy to join him in sponsoring the bill he has introduced.

The subject dealt with by the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from South Dakota has been called to my attention by some of the members of two of the large farm organizations in my State. They discussed this very situation, although of course they did not do so in the detail in which it has been discussed and presented by the Senator from South Dakota. But they were hopeful that it might be found possible to arrange for some means of exchanging surplus commodities for materials which we need.

Last year, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I recall that a suggestion was made that a number of the foreign countries have

strategic materials which we need in our defense program, but seemingly there have been no arrangements for a system of exchanging our surplus agricultural commodities for the critical and strategic defense materials we need, so that we could readily obtain the benefit of those materials, which are so greatly needed for defense purposes.

So I desire to compliment and commend the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for introducing the bill; and if he wishes to have me do so, I shall be happy to join him in sponsoring it.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Kansas very much, and I shall be happy to add his name to be added as one of the sponsors of the bill.

I may say, Mr. President, we are making pretty good headway. On behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself, we welcome the association of the other Senators who have expressed their support for the proposed legislation, namely, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL].

I only regret that earlier in the day I promised my distinguished friend, the minority leader, that this would be a short speech; otherwise, I should try to extend my remarks long enough to get a majority of Senators as sponsors of the bill, so that we might pass the measure now. However, I realize that legislation of the kind proposed ought to have careful committee study, and should be given careful scrutiny; and, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, I make no claims to perfection. I think we are attacking a basic problem in the agricultural picture which must be solved if we are to have a permanent farm program which will operate to the advantage of the farmer and be within the capacity of our American economy to sustain. We believe that the measure submitted wrestles with that problem in a general way, will help assure the taxpayer a sound economy, and will assure the farmer, first of all, an opportunity to sell his products in the market place at a fair and decent level, and will afford to the Government the opportunity to put under the farmer's prices a price floor which will give him the parity he deserves, without in turn jeopardizing the Government by putting it in the business of stockpiling endlessly products of which it cannot dispose.

I yield again to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry before concluding, though I alert the distinguished minority leader that his turn is about to arrive.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I simply wish to point out the alternative, in the event we fail to meet the challenge which agriculture faces today, namely, the disposal of relatively small and temporary surpluses. If we fail to devise any means of meeting this challenge, we shall then be forced to restrict the production of certain commodities. I would name wheat, cotton, and possibly a few others, which we are producing in surplus and which

ordinarily are exportable commodities. If we are forced to restrict the production of those commodities, then there will be two serious results. The first will be a reduction in the income of the American farmer, and consequently, a reduction in his purchasing power, which he would utilize in buying the products of industry and of the other people who go to make up the population of our Nation.

The second result would be the creation of hard feelings on the part of other countries of the world, who look askance at any suggestion that the United States, the greatest food producing country in the world, would consider reducing production of food of which so many countries in the world are today short. So we must devise some means whereby our surpluses, which I still maintain are comparatively small, can be sent to the nations which are trying to meet shortages of the very same commodities as best they can.

Mr. MUNDT. Again, I thank the Senator from Vermont very much. To what he has said, I would add but two very short statements about economics. The first is that a surplus, even though small, has a depressing effect upon all the products involved in the creation of the surplus. So we have a very dangerous situation occurring at the price-level point, whenever we produce a product in surplus, because the price the consumer is willing to pay for the item in surplus tends to permeate down to what he is willing to pay for all the items engaged in building up the surplus.

In the next place, it is certainly true, as my distinguished friend from Vermont has pointed out, that unless we can find a way by which we can provide a market for such surplus products, we not only depress the income which the farmer receives, but, every time we depress the income of the American farmer by a single dollar, we depress the national economy by \$7; because, for over a half century, the economic tables demonstrate clearly that in this country the total national income is seven times the total income obtain by the creators of new wealth. So when anything tends to reduce the level of the farmer's income by a dollar, it destroys by seven times that much the whole national income, which in turn reduces the income of labor, reduces the capacity of the Government to collect from the taxpayers the money it needs to conduct its operations and to pay the national debt and the interest, and also reduces the profits made by businessmen generally.

And now, I will say to the minority leader, while this has not been exactly a short speech, I still submit that, according to the senatorial standards by which we operate, it cannot be called a long one; and I am happy to yield the floor. Before doing so, may I say that I have just been informed that my colleague the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] desire to add their names as cosponsors of this bill. I am indeed happy to add their names to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have listened with interest and appreciation to the very informative address by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and I trust it will prove productive of much good.

AUTHORIZATION FOR EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 86) authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of pride and confidence that I rise to urge the approval of Senate Resolution 86, submitted by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The senior Senator from Texas is proud of the past achievements of the Senate Preparedness Committee. He is confident that under the able leadership of his good friend, the senior Senator from Massachusetts, the work of the committee will be carried on in the same nonpartisan spirit of the past.

In the ordinary course of events, a shift in control of a legislative body also means a shift in the outlook of that body. In the case of the Senate Preparedness Committee this need not be so nor do I think it will be so.

The spirit of partisanship has never governed the deliberations of the Senate Preparedness Committee. We have been partisans only for the defense and security of our country. We have been advocates only of an efficient and an effective defense program.

As the chairman of that committee for the past 2½ years, the senior Senator from Texas can testify that no member—be he Democrat or Republican—has brought his politics with him into the committee room.

I am grateful for the support that they have given me. Without their nonpartisan, unstinting cooperation, the achievements of the committee would not have been possible.

As a member of the minority on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I shall strive to match the selfless nonpartisanship demonstrated by the present majority members when the situation was reversed.

Mr. President, the need for continuing the Senate Preparedness Committee is, to my mind, self-evident.

We are passing through one of the great crises of American history and one of the great crises of mankind. We are confronted with the issue of survival—survival of our Nation and survival of freedom as a tenet of Government.

The tensions of our world are in many respects greater than those which existed before Pearl Harbor.

In Korea, American soldiers are engaged in a hot war which may any day be dwarfed by a greater cataclysm.

One of our planes has been shot out of the air space over Germany and an-

other attacked in the northern reaches of the Pacific by an unfriendly power.

Part of our continent has been reconnoitered by planes which have not been identified officially but which unquestionably belong to the same power.

All of these factors must be considered against the background of the change now taking place in the Soviet regime. Can we avoid the thought that one of the men in the Kremlin may plunge the whole world into war as one step of a master plan to seize absolute and uncontested power?

Mr. President, we can surmount this crisis—but only if we are resolute and determined. We can live through this period—but only if we heed the dictates of reason rather than the dictates of panic. We can survive—but only if we act as a unified people in mutual confidence, alert to the hard realities of our times.

There is an important role for the Senate Preparedness Committee in this period. It can be—and should be—the agency of Congress which works with the Defense Department in solving the problems of America's preparedness.

The members of the Senate Preparedness Committee have never looked upon themselves as a body of prosecutors. They have regarded investigations as a method of looking for positive steps to correct deficiencies—not merely as a means for detecting and punishing culprits.

The objectives of the committee have been twofold:

First, to determine whether this Nation is doing enough—soon enough—to safeguard the lives and liberties of our people.

Second, to determine whether we are getting full use out of our defense dollar—to be certain that we are not squandering our money uselessly.

In our investigations, we have sought the cooperation of the members of the executive agencies charged with responsibility for carrying out the defense program. Sometimes we have received that cooperation and sometimes it has been refused.

But whether cooperation was offered or withheld, we were never satisfied with merely exposing unsatisfactory conditions. We insisted—with all the force at our disposal—that the changes in mobilization policy and practice revealed as necessary by our investigations be made promptly. We insisted—with equal force—that wasteful practices be discontinued and that efficient and sound methods be adopted.

Because of our insistence, the Nation's synthetic rubber industry—so vital to our defense—was restored to health and the taxpayers were saved well over \$1 billion.

Because of our insistence, the Government presented a solid front against the international tin cartel and the taxpayers were saved at least \$500 million.

Because of our insistence, wasteful and imprudent practices for the disposal of surplus commodities were eliminated.

Because of our insistence, supplies of critical nickel and tungsten have been increased.

Because of our insistence, the armed services have instituted "cost consciousness" campaigns which, if followed through, will result in saving billions of dollars.

Because of our insistence, the armed services stripped surplus manpower from its training centers—an act which ultimately will save at least \$50 million a year.

Our battle against waste, inefficiency, and prodigal spending was summed up in our 34th report issued on December 7, 1951, in which we said:

It is a distressing—but inescapable—fact that one of our major shortages is a sense of prudence, a zeal for frugality, and an enthusiasm for economy on the part of the armed services.

The inevitable result of this shortage is waste—waste of manpower, waste of equipment, and waste of the taxpayers' money.

Our battle against the apathy and "siesta psychology" that has characterized so much of our defense program was summed up in our 4th report on December 27, 1950, in which we said:

As a result, it may be fair to say that our most critical shortage is not one of nickel, or wool, or rubber, or any other commodity, but rather a shortage of bold planning.

Our battle against those who were failing to arm the United States at the necessary level and speed was summed up in our 39th report issued on June 17, 1952, in which we said:

The question of an adequate air defense for these United States is a question of life and death for ourselves and our institutions.

Our defense leaders responsible for our military protection do not believe we have the strength we need; they do not believe we will have the strength we need unless we raise our sights at once and raise them drastically.

The problem of our defense is a continuing one. It is not solved in 1 day or 1 year—or even the 2½ years in which the committee has been in existence.

The problem is as acute today as it was in July 1950, when the Preparedness Committee was formed. If anything, the need for the committee is even more pressing in light of the state of world affairs.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be pleased to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The question I should like to ask is this: Has the situation changed considerably from what it was a year ago that it makes military leaders so apprehensive as to our defense and our preparedness that they are now advocating something entirely different and more expanded than they advocated a year ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I cannot speak for the military leaders, nor do I know with certainty to whom the Senator from Minnesota refers. I was quoting from a report issued by the Preparedness Subcommittee based upon testimony taken from the Joint Chiefs of Staff almost a year ago. I am not in position to speak for the military leaders beyond the testimony they gave to our committee. But I do think it is extremely important, in the

light of the developments of the past 10 days, that the committee continue to function, and to have the military leaders come before it and explain what defense build up we should have, and to what extent it should go.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the reason why I was prompted to ask the question of the Senator from Texas was primarily because of a speech which I believe the Senator delivered last Sunday evening which dealt with the same question. My understanding of it was that the Senator from Texas was somewhat critical of our lack of national defense and was of the opinion that our national defense must be stepped up. For that reason I was prompted to ask the question.

Is there a report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff which would indicate that we are in a more precarious position than we were in a year ago? As I recall, Congress appropriated great sums of money for national defense, but not all of that money has been expended in the period since the Congress made the appropriation. I was wondering whether there is some international situation on which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have reported that makes it necessary that our national defense should be greatly stepped up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say in reply to the Senator from Minnesota that the Congress has never appropriated and the Defense Department has never requested the full amount the Joint Chiefs of Staff have felt was necessary to insure the security of this Nation.

Mr. THYE. But, Mr. President, there are unexpended funds at the present time in a greater amount than had been anticipated when Congress deliberated on the appropriations a year ago. Why have not the funds been expended?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it takes a period of years to produce some of the items needed for the defense of this Nation. So long as we have the system which is now in force there will always be unexpended funds. Production takes many years, depending on the items in question.

Mr. THYE. I grant that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Last year we had a cut-back program, and the Defense Department requested less money than the Joint Chiefs of Staff thought was absolutely essential to protect the Nation's security.

Mr. THYE. We take the word of the Defense Department as being the truth with reference to the entire international as well as the national situations. As a member of the Appropriations Committee and of the subcommittee on military appropriations, I know that we granted the military the funds they stated were necessary in order to provide adequate defense for our Nation in the light of the world situation.

I go back to the original question. Is there something in the world situation today which places us in a more precarious situation than that in which we found ourselves a year ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think we have improved our situation since last year. But the Senator from Minnesota

6/11/53

-4-

26. RUBBER. Rep. Shafer inserted a summary prepared by the Rubber Manufacturers Association of the hearings on H.R. 5425, the synthetic rubber plant disposal bill (p. A3589).

BILLS INTRODUCED

27. POTATOES. S. 2124, by Sen. Welker, relating to the repacking of Irish potatoes which have been introduced or delivered for introduction into interstate commerce; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee (p. 6589).
28. FOREIGN AID. S. 2127, by Sen. Schoepel, to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to transfer certain surplus agricultural commodities to the Director for Mutual Security for sale to countries participating in the mutual security program; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 6589). Remarks of author (pp. 6634-6).
29. AGRICULTURE CENSUS. H.R. 5695, by Del. Fernos-Isern, to amend section 16 of the act of June 18, 1929, so as to include Puerto Rico in the census of agriculture authorized thereby; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 6655).
30. WOOL. H.R. 5700, by Rep. Fisher, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, to encourage the domestic production of wool as a critical and strategic defense material; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 6655).
31. PERSONNEL. H.R. 5703, by Rep. McCarthy, to limit the period for collection by the U. S. of compensation received by officers and employees in violation of the dual compensation laws; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (pp. 6655-6).
- H.R. 5706, by Rep. Rees, to facilitate civil-service appointment of persons who lost opportunity therefor because of service in the Armed Forces after June 30, 1950, and to provide certain benefits upon appointment; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 6656).

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR JUNE 12: Transfer surplus wheat to Pakistan, S. Agriculture (Morse, Dulles, Stassen to testify). FCA reorganization, crop insurance, and potato price support bills, H. Agriculture (exec.). Marking "USA" on containers of exported U. S. goods, S. Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

-0-

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105A.

-0-

- claimed that agriculture's troubles "are not occasioned by high interest rates primarily, but by surpluses" (p. 6604).
16. CREDIT UNION. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendments S. 1665, to amend the Federal Credit Union Act relating to the declaration of dividends to members (S. Rept. 394) (p. 6589).
17. INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS. Sen. Carlson inserted his speech made before the National Chamber of Commerce discussing S. 1514, creating the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the work which this commission must do in determining proper Federal-State relationships (pp. 6590-2).
18. AIR POLLUTION. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution urging Congress to enact H.R. 2720, providing for the rapid amortization of facilities constructed by private industry for the control of air pollution (p. 6588).
19. SUBMERGED LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with amendments S. 1901, to provide for U. S. jurisdiction over submerged lands off the outer Continental Shelf seaward from established State boundaries (p. D542).
20. RECESSED until Mon., June 15 (p. 6636). The legislative program for Mon., as stated by the acting majority leader: Complete action on S. 1946, D. C. crime bill; then begin debate on H.R. 5227, the Agriculture appropriation bill for 1954 (p. 6625).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

21. WEATHER. Sen. Langer inserted Frank Edwards' recent radio broadcast discussing the possible effects on the weather of testing atomic bombs in the U. S. (pp. A3563-4).
22. TVA. Rep. Jones inserted a Madison County (Ala.) Farmers' Ass'n resolution urging continued support of TVA and its recent request for appropriations to expand the program (p. A3567).
Rep. Gwinn inserted correspondence between himself and the Governor of Tenn. expressing concern over the proposed reduction of appropriations for TVA (pp. A3589-92).
23. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Thye inserted Alfred Stedman's article, "Ike's Farm Task", discussing some of the pending farm problems and suggesting a "modified farm program of moderate supports, and deliberate stockpiling of safe reserves" (p. A3570).
Rep. Zablocki inserted a Wisconsin Democratic Farm Conference statement on farm policy, discussing the situation of dairy and livestock farmers and the program needed to build up markets for Wisconsin dairy products and to maintain family-size farms, and a resolution criticizing the present Administration's REA program (pp. A3599-601).
24. IMMIGRATION. Sen. Wiley inserted several letters favoring S. 1917, to admit 240,000 non-quota refugees and escapees into the U. S. (pp. A3576-77).
25. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Bricker inserted a statement announcing the installation of the most efficient steam-electric generating unit in the world at the Philo power-plant in Ohio (pp. A3578-79).

83D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2127

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 11 (legislative day, JUNE 8), 1953

Mr. SCHOEPEL introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to transfer certain surplus agricultural commodities to the Director for Mutual Security for sale to countries participating in the Mutual Security program.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress
4 to use defined stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation
5 to expand free world economies by promoting trade and
6 increasing production of cooperating nations. In furtherance
7 of this policy, the Commodity Credit Corporation, notwith-
8 standing any other provision of law, is authorized to make
9 surplus stocks of any agricultural commodity available to

1 the Director for Mutual Security (hereinafter referred to
2 as the Director) for sale as hereinafter provided, and to
3 deliver such commodities as may be sold at such times, in
4 such quantities, and at such places within the United States,
5 including free on board vessel American ports, as the Di-
6 rector may request. Surplus stocks of any commodity shall
7 be that quantity of any agricultural commodity or product
8 thereof acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under
9 the price-support programs which the Secretary of Agri-
10 culture determines is in excess of probable domestic and
11 export sales plus a reserve for working stocks. The invest-
12 ment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in all commodi-
13 ties delivered hereunder plus all costs incurred in making
14 delivery, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall
15 not exceed \$1,000,000,000. For the purpose of making
16 payment to Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities
17 delivered by it hereunder, the Secretary of the Treasury is
18 hereby authorized from time to time upon request of the
19 Commodity Credit Corporation to cancel notes of the Com-
20 modity Credit Corporation held by him pursuant to the Act
21 of March 31, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-4), in
22 an amount as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture
23 equal to the investment in such commodities plus all costs
24 incurred by Commodity Credit Corporation in making
25 delivery.

1 SEC. 2. The Director for Mutual Security is authorized to
2 offer to sell such stocks made available by the Commodity
3 Credit Corporation destined to countries cooperating with the
4 Mutual Security Program under conditions negotiated by him
5 with the receiving countries and to accept in payment
6 therefor local currency for the account of the United States.
7 In negotiating agreements for the sale of such commodities,
8 the Director shall—

9 (a) offer such supplies only as net additions to
10 consumption in purchasing countries and to take special
11 precaution to safeguard against the substitution or dis-
12 placement of regular marketings of the United States
13 or friendly countries. In so doing he shall direct such
14 supplies primarily to underdeveloped and new market
15 areas and shall offer to sell such supplies at maximum
16 market prices and in no case at prices lower than those
17 offered for similar products by friendly countries.

18 (b) use to the fullest practicable extent private trade
19 channels to generate the maximum sales proceeds.

20 (c) assure that the purchasing countries do not
21 resell, transship, or use for other than domestic consump-
22 tion commodities purchased under this program without
23 specific approval by the Director.

24 SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the
25 Director shall expend the proceeds of such sales, with em-

1 phasis on expanding trade and increasing production for ex-
2 panding trade, among cooperating nations for the following
3 purposes, giving consideration to the priorities indicated
4 below to the maximum extent practicable—

5 (a) for goods or services needed as aid in other
6 cooperating countries;

7 (b) for increasing production of goods or services
8 needed in other cooperating countries, including strategic
9 materials, on a loan basis, with the authority to expend
10 sums received in repayment for the purposes specified in
11 this section;

12 (c) for increasing production for domestic needs
13 through regular banking channels on a loan basis or on
14 other terms of repayment, with the authority to expend
15 funds received in repayment for the purposes specified
16 in this section;

17 (d) for increasing production for domestic needs
18 using such sales proceeds as grants-in-aid;

19 (e) for making contributions to cooperative military
20 establishments;

21 (f) for purchasing critical materials for United
22 States stockpiles at levels above those now planned;

23 (g) for satisfying other United States obligations
24 payable in foreign currencies;

(h) for developing new markets on a mutually benefiting basis.

SEC. 4. In the use of sales proceeds, the Director shall, to the maximum extent practicable, encourage and facilitate the flow of private investment to and from within co-operating countries—

(a) by mobilizing private capital in connection with the making of loans; and

(b) by financing the development of transportation, power and other public utilities so as to furnish the conditions required to attract private investment.

SEC. 5. In negotiating terms, the Director shall assure that repayments by the cooperating countries are not utilized in such manner as to displace foreign exchange earnings that would otherwise accrue to them.

SEC. 6. In making agreements with third countries receiving goods accruing from the proceeds of such sales, the Director shall be guided by the provisions of this Act.

A BILL

To authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to transfer certain surplus agricultural commodities to the Director for Mutual Security for sale to countries participating in the Mutual Security program.

By Mr. SCHOEPP

JUNE 11 (legislative day, JUNE 8), 1953
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

veloped that where minimum sentences have been required, leaders in communities and members of legislative bodies have realized that the removal of discretion on the part of the judges has proven most unfortunate in individual cases. No precise yardstick should be required to be applied to every type of the many thousands of different personalities who appear before judges to be punished. The judge's discretion should be limited only by the maximum he can impose and the maximum should be sufficiently high to enable him to fix a severe sentence in aggravated cases.

In other words, I am making my plea for competence in the judiciary. I do not think that we, as legislators, ought

All convictions in the U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia for District of Columbia felony offenses¹ in relation to convictions for felonies included under the mandatory-minimum-sentence provisions of H. R. 420, 83d Cong., 1st sess., fiscal year ended June 30, 1952

	Numbers			Percentages		
	All dispositions	Imprisonment	Probation	All dispositions	Imprisonment	Probation
Total convictions for District of Columbia felony offenses ¹	759	629	130	100	82.9	17.1
Total convictions for felonies included under the mandatory-minimum-sentence provisions of H. R. 420, 83d Cong., 1st sess.:.....						
Number.....	316	279	37	100	88.3	11.7
Percent of total convictions.....	41.6	44.4	28.5			
Assault to commit rape.....	18	12	6	100	66.7	33.3
Robbery.....	127	120	7	100	94.5	5.5
Housebreaking.....	147	127	20	100	86.4	13.6
Rape.....	12	12		100	100.0	
Assault on police officer with dangerous weapon.....	12	8	4	100	66.7	33.3
Illegal possession of pistol after previous conviction for this offense.....						

¹ Exclusive of such gambling offenses as may be classified as felonies.

Source: U. S. Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice (data furnished by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts).

Mr. MORSE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a resolution from the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

While the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association fully believes in the need to protect society by long incarceration of repeated offenders and those who commit serious crimes and is opposed to mollycoddling of any offender, nevertheless it expresses opposition to legislation which requires judges to impose specified minimum terms of sentences upon defendants convicted of crime for the reason that no person, judge, prosecutor, or legislator, is in a position to determine in advance a just sentence without a careful study of the interests of both the public and the individual defendant who is concerned in any crime.

Experience has proven that where a rigid formula for sentencing is required by legislation without study of the individual concerned in the crime it has on occasions required judges to impose sentences which not only they but others concerned have been convinced were not in the interests either of the public or the defendant. In many instances, to avoid unjust sentences, pleas to lesser crimes have been accepted and juries have acquitted those guilty when it has been known mandatory sentences will be required. The judge should be given discretion in sentencing. To avoid abuses of discretion, the Advisory Council advocates more extensive study by judges of the sentencing process, including planned conferences among them-

to impose upon the judiciary this kind of straitjacket sentencing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks a table entitled "All Convictions in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for District of Columbia Felony Offenses in Relation to Convictions for Felonies Included Under the Mandatory-Minimum-Sentence Provisions of H. R. 420, 83d Congress, 1st Session, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1952."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

selves, with probation and parole officers, prosecutors, and those at penal institutions who daily come into contact with those convicted of crime. The Council also favors full discussion of the problems of sentencing at judicial conferences of judges, meetings of bar associations, and other groups interested in crime correction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter in opposition to the mandatory sentencing section of the bill, from Arthur J. Freund, of St. Louis, Mo., chairman of the Section of Criminal Law of the American Bar Association, one of the distinguished lawyers of America, and one of the keenest students in the entire field of criminal law and procedure.

There being no objection, the latter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
SECTION OF CRIMINAL LAW,
St. Louis, Mo., June 5, 1953.

Re S. 1946.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WAYNE: I write you with regard to S. 1946, recently introduced in the Senate. This bill is intended to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia, and unfortunately, in my view fixes mandatory minimum sentences in certain types of criminal cases. Ordinarily, we would not be greatly concerned with a measure which affects causes in the District only, but Federal legislation so often establishes a pattern

for legislation elsewhere, that I am deeply troubled by the departure in this bill from what is universally acknowledged by the most competent authorities as proper and correct practices.

The American Bar Association and the American Law Institute have approved and commended the Youth Authority Act which places great discretion in the courts and sentencing authorities in the determination of the punishment. The Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Herbert Brownell, Jr., in his address before the American Law Institute on May 22, 1953, stressed the values of the Youth Authority Act, particularly with respect to its broad and intelligent provisions in dealing with youthful offenders.

S. 1946, in providing for minimum sentences is a step backward. The punishment must fit the offender and only the judge or sentencing authority can determine proper punishment. We have seen through the course of history that harsh and indiscriminate punishments do not curb crime. The legislative body cannot properly determine in advance the punishment to be adjudged in a particular instance.

I write you at this length because I believe as serious mistake is being made in S. 1946 in the particular mentioned. If I can serve you in any way, please do not hesitate to call upon me. I have written a like letter to Senator BYRD and also to Congressman HENRY O. TALLE with respect to the companion bill in the House, H. R. 5312.

With my kindest regards,
Respectfully,

ARTHUR J. FREUND.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask for consideration in order, when the bill comes to a vote, the following amendments:

On page 6, after line 8, to strike out paragraph (c), beginning in line 9 and extending through line 17;

On page 6, after line 17, to strike out paragraph (d), through line 2 on page 7.

Mr. President, I think what is involved in this bill is so important from the standpoint of the administration of justice in the District of Columbia, as well as from the standpoint of the principles and precedents we would establish if the bill were passed tonight with only five Senators in the Chamber, that I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with, with the understanding that I may make a few remarks on the parliamentary situation and the agreement which I understand has been entered into.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that no attempt will be made to pass the bill tonight. I want the bill to go over until Monday, because I want the Senate to have an opportunity to consider the problems involved.

I think it would be well if the subject were discussed over the weekend. It would be difficult to obtain the attendance of very many Senators at this late hour. So with the understanding which

I have stated, and in order that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] may on Monday, or whenever the bill is brought up, have adequate time and a fair hearing on the amendments which he intends to offer, I think we ought to have a gentleman's understanding that the Senate will take a recess without passing the bill, but will allow the bill to go over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I agree to that; but before the Senate takes a recess, I wish to send to the desk amendments which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has agreed to accept.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments sent to the desk by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will be printed and lie on the table.

The amendments submitted by the Senator from New Jersey will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I understand that the committee has agreed to accept the amendments submitted by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I may say that so far as the committee is concerned, the procedure is that we shall ask that the committee amendments be first disposed of, and thereafter we shall accept the amendments submitted by the junior Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be open to amendment after the committee amendments shall have been disposed of.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to have printed a very fine editorial entitled "Machine Justice," from the Washington Post of June 6, 1953; also the editorial from the Washington Evening Star to which I referred in the colloquy a short time ago. It is entitled "Mandatory Sentences," and was published in the Washington Evening Star of June 10, 1953. I commend both editorials to the Senate for study and serious consideration.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of June 10, 1953]

MANDATORY SENTENCES

Reflected in the House debate over mandatory minimum sentences for certain serious crimes was an outraged public opinion over leniency toward criminals. Many persons have been shocked at disclosures in the Star of past tendencies to punish multiple offenders only for a picked few of their crimes. And frequently sentences have been made to run concurrently instead of consecutively. Fortunately there are indications that the judges voluntarily are taking steps to insure more adequate sentences here. Indeed, it should not be necessary to compel judges by law to assess effective penalties. In a sense, the proposal in the House-approved omnibus crime bill to limit discretion of the courts in fixing some penalties is a reflection on the competency of the bench in general. Yet it is to the credit of a number of the judges that, as a rule, they have used their discretion wisely.

Congress is justified, therefore, in hesitating over the mandatory-sentence provision of the Davis bill. Such an inflexible mandate to the judges leaves no room for consideration of humanitarian or other factors in the sentencing of a convict. To exclude

such considerations in certain cases could work hardships on prisoners or their dependents that might impair the quality of justice expected from our courts. But, regrettable as such a straitjacketing of justice might be, it would be no more regrettable than a rise in assaults, robberies, and other grave crimes because of an unwillingness of some judges to mete out proper punishment to habitual offenders. If Congress should finally decide to approve the mandatory-sentence plan, which the Star hopes will not be the case, it will be because a few members of the bench in the past have failed to meet their full responsibilities in protecting the public.

[From the Washington Post of June 6, 1953]

MACHINE JUSTICE

The Senate District Committee paid its respects to reason and sobriety on Thursday by cutting out of the omnibus District crime bill a section requiring mandatory minimum prison sentences for first offenders. The effect of this provision, which the House District Committee, led by Representative DAVIS, has unfortunately grafted onto the measure, is very seriously to restrict the discretion of judges in sentencing offenders, it makes the determination of penalties, a vital element in the administration of justice, as inflexible as the output of a vending machine.

Chief Judge Bolitha Laws of the United States district court has urged as vehemently as his office allows that the mandatory sentence feature of the crime bill be eliminated. United States Attorney Leo A. Rover, speaking from the point of view of a public prosecutor, inveighed against it with equal vigor. The aim of justice, he pointed out in a talk the other evening, is not vindictiveness but the rehabilitation of lawbreakers so that they can be restored to useful places in society. He is opposed also, very properly in our judgment, to another provision of the bill which would take away from judges the authority to parole prisoners after conviction for crimes with fixed minimum sentences or to place them on probation.

Within the Senate committee, Senator MORSE added his voice to the almost unbroken chorus of protest against the mandatory minimum sentence provision that has come from experienced penologists and from bench and bar. "I am unalterably opposed to taking away from the judge," he said, "the right to use his discretion. I will not support a bill that will bind the hands of judges."

There is no sentimentality or softness toward crime in this common-sense view. It is simply a realistic recognition that punishment ought to fit the criminal as well as the crime, that circumstances alter cases, that justice needs on occasion to be tempered with mercy and that society is best served by dealing with criminals as individual human beings who are most likely to be reformed by flexibility in the imposition of sentences. Judges are equipped by training and experience to mete out punishment in accordance with the particular situation. We hope heartily that the more enlightened position of the Senate will prevail over the House's rigidity when the District crime bill goes to conference.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, has the Senate taken a recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has not as yet recessed.

SALE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for

appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to transfer certain surplus agricultural commodities to the Director for Mutual Security for sale to countries participating in the mutual security program. I request that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2127) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to transfer certain surplus agricultural commodities to the Director for Mutual Security for sale to countries participating in the mutual security program, introduced by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to use defined stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation to expand free world economies by promoting trade and increasing production of cooperating nations. In furtherance of this policy, the Commodity Credit Corporation, notwithstanding any other provision of law, is authorized to make surplus stocks of any agricultural commodity available to the Director for Mutual Security (hereinafter referred to as the Director) for sale as hereinafter provided, and to deliver such commodities as may be sold at such times, in such quantities and at such places within the United States, including f. o. b. vessel American ports, as the Director may request. Surplus stocks of any commodity shall be that quantity of any agricultural commodity or product thereof acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price support programs which the Secretary of Agriculture determines is in excess of probable domestic and export sales plus a reserve for working stocks. The investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in all commodities delivered hereunder plus all costs incurred in making delivery, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall not exceed \$1 billion. For the purpose of making payment to Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities delivered by it hereunder, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized from time to time upon request of the Commodity Credit Corporation to cancel notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation held by him pursuant to the act of March 3, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713 a-4), in an amount as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture equal to the investment in such commodities plus all costs incurred by Commodity Credit Corporation in making delivery.

SEC. 2. The Director for Mutual Security is authorized to offer to sell such stocks made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation destined to countries cooperating with the mutual security program under conditions negotiated by him with the receiving countries and to accept in payment therefor local currency for the account of the United States. In negotiating agreements for the sale of such commodities, the Director shall:

(a) Offer such supplies only as net additions to consumption in purchasing countries and to take special precaution to safeguard against the substitution or displacement of regular marketings of the United States or friendly countries. In so doing he shall direct such supplies primarily to underdeveloped and new market areas and shall offer to sell such supplies at maximum market prices and in no case at prices lower than

those offered for similar products by friendly countries.

(b) Use to the fullest practicable extent private trade channels to generate the maximum sales proceeds.

(c) Assure that the purchasing countries do not resell, transship, or use for other than domestic consumption, commodities purchased under this program without specific approval by the Director.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Director shall expend the proceeds of such sales, with emphasis on expanding trade and increasing production for expanding trade, among cooperating nations for the following purposes, giving consideration to the priorities indicated below to the maximum extent practicable:

(a) For goods and services needed as aid in other cooperating countries;

(b) for increasing production of goods or services needed in other cooperating countries, including strategic materials, on a loan basis, with the authority to expend sums received in repayment for the purposes specified in this section;

(c) for increasing production for domestic needs through regular banking channels on a loan basis or on other terms of repayment, with the authority to expend funds received in repayment for the purposes specified in this section;

(d) for increasing production for domestic needs using such sales proceeds as grants-in-aid;

(e) for making contributions to cooperative military establishments;

(f) for purchasing critical materials for United States stockpiles at levels above those now planned;

(g) for satisfying other United States obligations payable in foreign currencies;

(h) for developing new markets on a mutually benefiting basis.

SEC. 4. In the use of sales proceeds, the Director shall, to the maximum extent practicable, encourage and facilitate the flow of private investment to and from within cooperating countries—

(a) by mobilizing private capital in connection with the making of loans; and

(b) by financing the development of transportation, power, and other public utilities so as to furnish the conditions required to attract private investment.

SEC. 5. In negotiating terms, the Director shall assure that repayments by the cooperating countries are not utilized in such manner as to displace foreign exchange earnings that would otherwise accrue to them.

SEC. 6. In making agreements with third countries receiving goods accruing from the proceeds of such sales, the Director shall be guided by the provisions of this act.

Mr. SCHOEPPLE. Mr. President, one of the challenges to America today is to assert the necessary leadership for directing its capabilities to the maintenance of freedom of the people. The United States must demonstrate to the world that a dynamic, expanding, competitive free enterprise system is a true way to the more abundant life that thoughtful people everywhere are seeking.

There is no change in the ambition of the Communists to dominate the world. They are placing more emphasis on economic and subversive methods than on military means for accomplishing their ultimate objective.

The United States, since the end of World War II has been very generous with her manpower, her money, and her natural resources in assisting friendly nations throughout the world to re-

habilitate themselves in the hope that we could not only stop the Communists where they are but return to freedom those enslaved people that are now behind the Iron Curtain.

Our economic aid programs during the past 7 years have cost the American taxpayer some \$35 billion.

As most of you gentlemen know, through the operations of the price support program here in the United States, we have accumulated large surpluses of agricultural commodities. According to the latest information, the Commodity Credit Corporation now has invested in farm commodities over \$3 billion. With the abundant harvest in prospect for 1953, it is estimated that by the end of the harvest season this year, Commodity Credit may have over \$5 billion invested in so-called surplus commodities.

With a great portion of the population of the free world needing food and clothing, it seems unrealistic to me that we should maintain these high stocks of food and fiber in the United States. I sincerely believe that these stocks can be changed from a liability to an asset through the utilization of these commodities in furthering our Mutual Security Program throughout the free world.

In making this statement I want to make it clear that the proposal I am about to make will not solve all of our domestic farm problems and our problems of increasing trade. However, I do believe that it is time now to give serious consideration to the question of how can we best use what we have to further the foreign economic objectives of the United States.

United States national security depends in part upon long-term defense arrangements with strong allies. These allies cannot live and prosper in a market limited to trade among themselves. We have heard that statement many times. They can be bound together in an enduring defense arrangement only if the great industrial nations including the United States and other cooperating nations of the free world are made mutually benefiting partners in an expanding free world economy.

One of the greatest needs for agriculture in the United States is to regain and expand the export outlets for agricultural commodities.

Many groups and individuals have been giving serious consideration to the problem of how we can use our surplus agricultural commodities for expanding trade and cementing our friendship with people throughout the world.

I offer for the consideration of this body a proposal to sell up to \$1 billion worth of Commodity Credit stocks to reinforce the mutual security program. This proposal would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer Commodity Credit Corporation stocks available for expanding world markets to the Administrator of the mutual security program.

It would authorize the Administrator of the mutual security program within limitations to be set by the Congress to offer such stocks for sale through private traders to cooperating nations under con-

ditions negotiated by him with receiving countries in exchange for local currencies. The Administrator would be authorized to accept such currencies for the United States and use them to reinforce the mutual security program and further its objectives by using these funds under mutual agreement, either, first, as loans to banking institutions in cooperating countries which in turn would use the funds to increase production and encourage international trade, or, second, to pay United States obligations such as contributions to cooperative defense establishments, for economic development, for aid to other cooperating countries and for strategic material to augment United States stockpiles above currently planned levels.

I believe that if these Commodity Credit stocks are used in the manner suggested they can be used as capital for the expansion of free world economies.

Some of the advantages of this proposal follow:

First. This is not a giveaway program. Its purpose is to sell United States agricultural supplies for a maximum of local currencies which may be used by the United States to aid in economic development and promoting trade among cooperating nations.

Second. This is not a dumping program. Its primary direction is toward new and underdeveloped areas. The prices are to be maximum. Acceptance by countries is voluntary. Marketings are safeguarded by assuring that quantities are net additions to consumption.

Third. It would convert likely liabilities resulting from CCC stocks to assets by using them for constructive purposes by investing them in economic development and expanding international trade.

Fourth. It would provide the United States with a powerful economic weapon to counter the Communist trade offensive which seeks to divide our allies by luring them into the Communist orbit.

Fifth. It would involve no additional appropriation or authorization of funds, in fiscal year 1954.

Sixth. It would temporize the drastic production cuts otherwise imminent.

Seventh. It should appeal to cooperating nations. It would increase their supplies of agricultural products which they need. It would provide for reinvesting the proceeds of sale in economic development and expanding trade among them.

It should be emphasized that the movement of agricultural commodities under this proposal would be a net addition to consumption in the cooperating countries and not a substitution or displacement of the normal movement. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Mutual Security Program would have to set some standards by which this could be judged.

This is not a dumping program. It is a program designed to sell to the cooperating nations for local currency these agricultural commodities at the full price which Commodity Credit has invested in these commodities.

There should be no element of coercion for cooperating nations to accept. This is a sincere offer to do business under clearly specified conditions for mutual benefit.

All funds accumulated to the United States as a result of this program regardless of the currency should be accounted for in terms of dollars.

I am sure that by this time one of the principal questions that occurs to the Members of this body is, how do we get our investment back? Under the draft legislation that I am submitting, the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized from time to time, upon request of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to cancel notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation held pursuant to the act of March 31, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-4) in an amount as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be equal to the investment in such commodities, plus all costs incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation in making delivery.

I would not for one moment try to indicate to this body that this program will not cost the United States money, but I ask the Senate to consider the alternatives. The fact is that the Commodity Credit Corporation already has or will have money invested in these commodities. The question then arises, how can we best use these commodities to make the maximum contribution to our domestic economy and to the economies of the rest of the free world?

This program should not be thought of in terms of reducing the appropriation for the mutual-security program, as originally conceived. However, we do believe that by the proper use of the

local currencies that would accumulate under this program, tremendous dollar savings can be realized, not only this year, but in many years to come.

Mr. President, at this time I may say that yesterday the Senator from Kansas appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee in furtherance of an amendment to the Mutual Security Act, but it was thought—and the Senator from Kansas thought—that the amendment should be presented as a separate bill. Hence I am introducing the bill, for consideration by the Senate, after the bill is referred to and considered by the appropriate committee.

I believe this proposal is sound, and would do more to demonstrate to the world that the United States is sincere in its efforts to help strengthen the economies of the other free nations, than anything that has been done since the end of World War II. Of course, many administrative details must be considered. However, I have confidence that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the mutual security program can develop procedures, under the framework of this measure, that will carry out the full intent and purpose of Congress in enacting the bill.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas has the floor.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the

Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 15, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 11 (legislative day of June 8), 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

Mason Sears, of Massachusetts, to be representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John C. Hughes, of New York, to be United States permanent representative on the North Atlantic Council, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Frank D. Yturria, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

PERMANENT APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, SUBJECT TO QUALIFICATIONS PROVIDED BY LAW

To be captains

Leonard S. Hubbard
Philip C. Doran

To be lieutenant commanders

Robert C. Darling
Miller J. Tonkel

To be lieutenant

Hubert W. Keith, Jr.

To be lieutenant (jg.)

Alfred C. Holmes

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be rear admiral

Henry C. Perkins

6/30/53

BILLS INTRODUCED

22. PERSONNEL. H. R. 5998, to provide that judicial review of dismissals for cause from the classified civil service may be had in the U. S. district courts; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee, by Rep. Fino (p. 7861).
23. DROUGHT RELIEF. H. R. 6009, by Rep. Thompson, Tex., to provide assistance to farmers and stockmen in areas where a production disaster caused by severe drought has occurred; to Agriculture Committee (p. 7861). Also H. R. 6014, by Rep. Mills (p. 7862).
H. R. 6010, by Rep. Trimble, to aid the drought-stricken areas of the U. S.; to Agriculture Committee (p. 7861).
24. FUR-FARMER LOANS. H. R. 6013, by Rep. Hill, to extend for 5 years the authority of this Department to make loans to fur farmers; to Agriculture Committee (p. 7862).
25. FOREIGN RELIEF. H. R. 6016, by Rep. Hope, to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the U. S.; to Agriculture Committee (p. 7862). Also S. 2249, by Sen. Aiken; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 7867). Remarks of Sen. Aiken on the bill (pp. 7886-8).
26. FARM LOANS. S. 2242, by Sen. Aiken, "to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act"; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 7867).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

27. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Perkins inserted Gordon R. Clapp's recent statement on policies toward TVA and REA and stating that "it is quite evident to the REA and TVA people that their backs are against the wall" (pp. A4181-2).
28. CONSERVATION. Rep. Grant inserted C. D. Kelley's address outlining plans for success in conservation movements, opposing the stockmen's grazing bill, and criticizing proposed reductions in appropriations for watershed programs (pp. A4182-4).
29. DROUGHT RELIEF. Extension of remarks of Rep. Edmondson urging immediate aid for drought relief areas and inserting requests from constituents (pp. A4191, 4193-5).
30. DISASTER RELIEF. Rep. Donohue inserted a Boston Post editorial and a Mass. Legislature resolution urging more Federal aid to tornado-stricken areas (p. A4204). Rep. Lane inserted a Boston Post article claiming an "Administration's brush-off of the tornado crisis" (p. A4205).
31. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Laird inserted an American Dairy Ass'n letter to newspaper editors, "Have You Been Fair With Dairy Farmers?" (pp. A4204-5).
32. WATER CONSERVATION. Rep. George inserted a newspaper editorial discussing increased water consumption and the importance of water projects (p. A4207).
33. OLEOMARGARINE. Rep. Rivers inserted a Washington Post editorial saying the butter-buying program is a threat to the margarine industry (p. A4212).
34. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Herrow inserted a New York Times editorial favoring shipment of wheat to Pakistan (p. A4217).

S. 2055, to provide for control and eradication of scrapie and blue tongue in sheep (S. Rept. 487)(p. 7867).

14. HOUSING LOANS. Agreed to the House amendment to S. 1993, to amend the National Housing Act and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (pp. 7870-1). The bill extends the VA direct-loan program for 1 year, authorizes \$25,000,000 each quarter, increases the maximum interest rate on direct loans to 4½%, and provides that the interest rate fixed on direct loans shall be the same as that on the regular guaranteed home loans. This bill will now be sent to the President.
15. NOMINATION. Confirmed the nomination of Robert B. McLeaish to be Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration (p. 7863).
16. ELECTRIFICATION. Received a Wis. Legislature resolution supporting REA (p. 7864).
17. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Sen. Wiley inserted a Wis. Federation of Labor resolution favoring this project (p. 7865).
18. TREATIES. Sens. Williams and Wiley inserted Del. and Colo. Legislature resolutions favoring the Bricker resolution to limit treaty powers (pp. 7864-6).
19. IMMIGRATION. Sen. Humphrey inserted a Minn. Federation of Women's Clubs resolution favoring immigration of 240,000 refugees (p. 7864).
20. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Sen. Potter inserted and criticized answers of the Treasury Department to his questions regarding changes in operation of the Export-Import Bank under Reorganization Plan 5 (pp. 7888-92).
21. FOREIGN AID. Continued debate on S. 2128, to extend the Mutual Security Act (pp. 7871-83, 7892-7, 7903-63).
 - Agreed to the following amendments:
 - By Sen. Johnson, Tex., to authorize the President to withhold \$1 billion of funds pending adoption of the European defense pact (pp. 7871-3).
 - By Sen. Wiley, authorizing the President to transfer between appropriations of up to 15 percent (rather than 10 percent) of the aggregate of such authorized appropriations (pp. 7874-83, 7892-7, 7903-47).
 - Rejected the following amendments:
 - By Sen. Dirksen, 28-42, to make available \$25,000,000 for the purchase of surplus CCC commodities for use of Asia-Pacific countries (pp. 7949-53), after rejecting Sen. McCarran's amendment to this amendment to increase the amount to \$35,000,000 (p. 7952).
 - By Sen. Dirksen, to provide that at least half of the authorized appropriations for use of NATO countries shall be in the form of loans (p. 7953).
 - By Sen. Humphrey, 12-54, to authorize the President to make available for purchase up to \$50 million of surplus CCC commodities for relief of famine in friendly countries (pp. 7954-63).
 - During the debate Sen. Langer defended the rejection of the British bid on power generators and transformers for the Chief Joseph Dam, criticized Britain for being the only country out of 46 nations which has failed to sign the new International Heat Agreement, claimed the Point 4 program has failed, and asked how any Senator who comes from a farming State can vote for the pending bill (pp. 7927-33).

AUTHORITY TO UTILIZE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

M E S S A G E

FROM

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

TRANSMITTING

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD GIVE
AUTHORITY TO UTILIZE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES HELD
BY THIS GOVERNMENT TO MEET NEEDS ARISING FROM FAMINE
OR OTHER URGENT RELIEF REQUIREMENTS

JUNE 30, 1953.—Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be
printed

To the Congress of the United States:

Because of the great productivity of our farms, the people of the United States have been able, on several occasions in recent years, to come to the aid of friendly countries faced with famine. In 1951 agricultural supplies were provided to India, and only recently wheat has been made available to the people of Pakistan. In both instances we were able to provide assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements by using stocks of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. On each of these occasions the Congress has been forced to add consideration of these emergency programs to its very heavy workload. This procedure not only adds to the congressional burden but also slows the speed with which this Government can come to the assistance of a nation urgently needing relief.

I therefore believe it advisable to have general legislation which, within appropriate limitations, would permit the President to meet these situations. The legislation I am requesting would give the President the authority to utilize agricultural commodities held by this Government, but it would limit that authority to meet only the

occasional needs arising from famine or other urgent relief requirements.

The objectives of such a program are not to be confused with the principal objective of our mutual security program. The mutual security program aims at promoting the long-range security of the United States by assisting our friends to strengthen their long-range economic and defensive capabilities. The program I am now proposing aims at mitigating the hard blows of unusual and urgent emergencies.

Since we cannot adequately foresee the specific needs to be met under the legislation I am requesting, we cannot now determine the most effective and equitable conditions under which such assistance may be rendered in a particular situation. Consequently, I am requesting authority to establish, when the need arises, the terms and conditions under which these agricultural commodities shall be made available.

In order that there may be a minimum of delay in assisting nations stricken with famine or having other urgent relief requirements, I am requesting that the Commodity Credit Corporation be given authority to make available from its stocks the necessary agricultural commodities to meet these emergency needs. To prevent impairment of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to permit necessary budgetary adjustments, I am recommending an authorization to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent of its investment in commodities furnished by it, plus any other costs, including interest, which it may incur in carrying out programs authorized under this act. When the costs of any programs carried out under terms of this act can be ascertained, the Congress will be asked to appropriate the necessary funds to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. I further propose that the authority to undertake programs of famine and other urgent relief assistance under this legislation expire on June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1953.*



83d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6016

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 30, 1953

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and
4 directed to make available to the President, out of stocks of
5 agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit
6 Corporation through price support operations, such agricul-
7 tural commodities as may be requested by the President for
8 transfer to any nation friendly to the United States in order

1 to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such
2 nation. The President may make such transfer through such
3 agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and condi-
4 tions as he deems appropriate. .

5 SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the
6 Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of
7 hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to
8 the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the
9 Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal
10 to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, in-
11 cluding handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making
12 deliveries hereunder. Any assets available to the Com-
13 modity Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such
14 appropriations or payments, for carrying out the purposes
15 of this Act.

16 SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken
17 under the authority of this Act after June 30, 1955.

A BILL

To authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

By Mr. HOPE

JUNE 30, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

83D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2249

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 30 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1953

Mr. AIKEN introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and
4 directed to make available to the President, out of stocks of
5 agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit
6 Corporation through price-support operations, such agri-
7 cultural commodities as may be requested by the President
8 for transfer to any nation friendly to the United States in

1 order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of
2 such nation. The President may make such transfer through
3 such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and
4 conditions as he deems appropriate.

5 SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the
6 Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of
7 hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated
8 to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in
9 the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are
10 equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities,
11 including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making
12 deliveries hereunder. Any assets available to the Commodity
13 Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such appro-
14 priations or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this
15 Act.

16 SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken
17 under the authority of this Act after June 30, 1955.

A BILL

To authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

By Mr. AIKEN

JUNE 30 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

presidential power commensurate with their congressional power should provide an ideal situation.

Third. Pressure groups and organizations of self-serving and selfish citizens would automatically find their national influence sharply curtailed once they were forced to sell their wares in every voting area of America rather than operating as they now do under conditions made ideal for pressure groups, since they now concentrate on selected large blocs of electoral votes located in our metropolitan areas and in States with vast populations where the individual voter by his ballot has from 5 to 15 times the power and the determining authority of the voter in a smaller, a rural, or a southern State. Those who would push our country leftward toward totalitarian centralized controls and toward national socialism would not be able to exert pressures on our presidential candidates and our party platforms and policies at all commensurate with their present power if each congressional district could elect its own presidential elector rather than having many States where great masses of voters in congested cities—frequently boss-led—providing a golden opportunity for pressure groups to threaten candidates for President with great blocs of votes delivered or withheld, in accordance with a candidate's willingness to go along with the selfish motives which have brought together these power blocs of organized voters. The power of such pressure groups would be in proportion to their actual numbers in the population.

Fourth. The election-by-district system would give to both large and small States their proper weight, properly divided between their parties, in the election of a President; and it would restore and preserve the balance between urban and rural areas, between great States and small ones, which was intended by our constitutional forefathers, and which is established and recognized in our bicameral system, with each State having two Members of the Senate and each State having the number of Representatives in the House to which its population entitles it. However, in each House of Congress each official casts a vote of like power and authority. Representative COUDERT and I propose that each of our constituents—each voter in America—shall likewise have a vote of like power and authority in the election of his President.

Fifth. Provide an opportunity for qualified citizens from any State to become candidates for President and for Vice President, because no longer would our political parties have to play up to mass populations in large States by nominating candidates to "appeal to New York" to "get the California vote," to "hold Pennsylvania," or to "assure the vote" of Michigan, Illinois, or Ohio. Henceforth, each candidate would have to appeal to all the people, because each citizen would cast his vote for three presidential electors, and there would be no statewide, one-unit, power blocs of 45 or 32 or 27 votes or whatnot. The presidential appeal would have to be, as it should be, to the individual voter in his place of residence—not to pressure

groups or organized blocs or statewide units of electoral votes on the "winner-take-all" basis which now operates, so that a handful of votes, more or less, in a State such as New York, Pennsylvania, or California, for example, gives the victor the entire electoral vote, even though 49.99 percent of the voters may have voted for the other candidate and for the opposition party.

Sixth. Encourage the development of a two-party system in the South and a continuation of the salutary situation developed in the last campaign when President Eisenhower, as a Republican presidential candidate, for the first time since the War Between the States, campaigned throughout the South with the same vigor and determination that he demonstrated as a candidate in Northern States. Virtually every southern State now has at least one congressional district where "the vote is not in the bag" and where, through crossfiling, through a political realignment, through a coalition between like-minded voters, or through the orthodox operations of our two-party system, presidential candidates of both political parties would find it necessary and/or desirable to campaign for the votes of individual southerners whose votes-by-districts would henceforth count as much and deserve to be courted as fully as the votes of individual voters in New York, in Chicago, or in Detroit.

Mr. President, there are other continuing advantages, as I see it, of the electoral reform being sponsored by Representative COUDERT and me in our joint resolutions. I do not desire to belabor the record further at this time, however. I hope subsequent discussion and public hearings before the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and the House will continue these explorations into the merits of the change proposed.

Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate longer today on this subject. I realize that the unfinished business is the mutual aid bill, and that our attention must be devoted to it. However, I thought perhaps this might be a propitious time—being shortly before the Fourth of July—to recall that, as Americans, we have some problems which are American to which we might well devote some attention, besides engaging in discussion of the question of how many billions of dollars to send abroad and how far to inject our influence and how far to interfere in the affairs of people living thousands of miles from us.

As I understand, a committee to study electoral reform has been created by the American Good Government Society, which has its national headquarters here in Washington at 1624 I Street NW. This special committee plans to study and survey the proposals made by Representative COUDERT and myself, as well as the several other proposals and suggestions now before the Senate and the House in regard to the problem of electoral reform. Those desiring further factual data on the subject can secure it by writing to the American Good Government Society in Washington, D. C.

Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty, Mr. President; and that vigi-

lance must be devoted to the mechanics of our electoral system as carefully as we devote it to our security measures, for the mechanics of the system make the conditions that are decisive in the election process. It would indeed be tragic if practices which have grown up were so to pervert the proper functioning of our processes for electing a President that some day they should carry this country into a collectivist state which the vast majority of all Americans oppose. Unthinking devotion to political labels, or meaningless party slogans, in response to the appeals of leaders, unworkable partisan groupings, and unequal weight accorded to the "vote power" of our individual citizens can contribute to such an undesirable eventuality.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for an observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As a cosponsor with former Senator Lodge of the bill on electoral reform which was discussed during the last session, I desire to commend the Senator from South Dakota for his splendid presentation of this matter at this time. I have not studied the contents of his joint resolution, but I have studied the so-called Wilmerding formula; and from what the Senator from South Dakota has said, I gather that his resolution comes close to the so-called Wilmerding formula.

Mr. MUNDT. There is a great deal of similarity between the two. The new resolution also seeks to attain the objective sought to be obtained by the Lodge-Gossett proposal. We believe this joint resolution has some superiorities, as compared to the Lodge-Gossett proposal—first of all, in respect to maintaining the proportionate importance of each State in the Union from the standpoint of its standing at election time, and also from the standpoint of preserving the two-party system, which most Americans agree is vital to the maintenance of our liberty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Wilmerding proposal was somewhat different from the Lodge proposal. I think some Members of the House have used it in proposals of their own. I think Representative COUDERT did in his resolution at the last session.

Let me assure the Senator from South Dakota that I shall be glad to discuss this matter with him. I rose at this time to congratulate him upon the fine presentation he has made.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from New Jersey very much, indeed. I know he will continue his interest in this very important problem.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me say that it is also a pleasure to be associated with the Senator from South Dakota in any endeavor.

Mr. MUNDT. We have been associated before in connection with other proposals of this kind. If this resolution can flower into enactment in the way the Smith-Mundt bill did, I am sure both of us will be delighted.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

AUTHORITY TO USE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES FOR FAMINE OR OTHER URGENT RELIEF OF FOREIGN NATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 202)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Because of the great productivity of our farms, the people of the United States have been able, on several occasions in recent years, to come to the aid of friendly countries faced with famine. In 1951 agricultural supplies were provided to India, and only recently wheat has been made available to the people of Pakistan. In both instances, we were able to provide assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements by using stocks of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. On each of these occasions the Congress has been forced to add consideration of these emergency programs to its very heavy workload. This procedure not only adds to the congressional burden but also slows the speed with which this Government can come to the assistance of a nation urgently needing relief.

I therefore believe it advisable to have general legislation which, within appropriate limitations, would permit the President to meet these situations. The legislation I am requesting would give the President the authority to utilize agricultural commodities held by this Government, but it would limit that authority to meet only the occasional needs arising from famine or other urgent relief requirements.

The objectives of such a program are not to be confused with the principal objective of our mutual-security program. The mutual-security program aims at promoting the long-range security of the United States by assisting our friends to strengthen their long-range economic and defensive capabilities. The program I am now proposing aims at mitigating the hard blows of unusual and urgent emergencies.

Since we cannot adequately foresee the specific needs to be met under the legislation I am requesting, we cannot now determine the most effective and equitable conditions under which such assistance may be rendered in a particular situation. Consequently, I am requesting authority to establish, when the need arises, the terms and conditions under which these agricultural commodities shall be made available.

In order that there may be a minimum of delay in assisting nations stricken with famine or having other urgent relief requirements, I am requesting that the Commodity Credit Corporation be given authority to make available from its stocks the necessary agricultural com-

modities to meet these emergency needs. To prevent impairment of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to permit necessary budgetary adjustments, I am recommending an authorization to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent of its investment in commodities furnished by it, plus any other costs, including interest, which it may incur in carrying out programs authorized under this act. When the costs of any programs carried out under terms of this act can be ascertained, the Congress will be asked to appropriate the necessary funds to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. I further propose that the authority to undertake programs of famine and other urgent relief assistance under this legislation expire on June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). The message will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for appropriate reference. It is a bill which will carry out the desires of the President as stated in the message to the Congress which has just been read. This bill would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to turn over or make available to the President surplus commodities owned by the Corporation, for purposes of relief in friendly and needy countries. It would permit the President to act promptly if the need arose, whether the Congress were in session or not.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has before it now for consideration several bills upon which hearings have not yet been held, because the chairman of the committee has understood that this message would come from the White House to the Congress.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2249) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States, introduced by Mr. AIKEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The statement of the Senator from Vermont, Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, would indicate that the authorization would relate to assistance to foreign countries. However, our major concern at this time is our own domestic problem, occasioned by the drought which exists in the extreme Southwest. Would the bill permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available to the southwestern area of this Nation feed grains, such as corn and any other grains which would be suitable for use as feed?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Commodity Credit Corporation now has full authority to make grains owned by the corporation available to a distressed area within this country. I am not sure whether it also has full authority to make hay available. But let me say to the Senator from Minnesota, because and I know how deeply interested he is in this matter, that the staff of the Department of Agriculture have been working days, and I suppose nights too, during the past few days, in the preparation of a program which will be submitted to the Congress. Conformable legislation would be expected to provide an effective program to relieve the drought-stricken areas. I may say I expect the program will be submitted to Congress probably before the end of the day; if not, it will certainly be submitted tomorrow.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation would not include hay, but would consist of grains subject to storage. Hay is a commodity which would have to be dealt with specifically, since the Commodity Credit Corporation does not hold hay, but would have to purchase it, in order to meet the present requirements for feed in the drought-stricken area of the Southwest.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say the Department of Agriculture has been making a very detailed study of the situation, in order to determine what legislation may be needed in order to carry out a program of relief which would include the furnishing of hay to the distressed area.

Mr. THYE. That is splendid.

Mr. AIKEN. I know the Senator from Minnesota has that in mind. I am satisfied that it will not be more than 24 hours before the program will be submitted to the Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I may say I am delighted to have this message from the President. To me it shows a great deal of good, sound sense. I am grateful to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the announcement made today that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will hold early hearings, not only to consider the necessity of such legislation as that suggested by the President, but also to consider the bills dealing with the same subject which are now before the committee. Last March the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I, together with 5, 6, or 7 of our colleagues, introduced a measure proposing to create a Foreign Trade Division within the Commodity Credit Corporation. That measure, if it had been enacted, would have accomplished exactly what the President's proposal suggests, plus certain additional provisions not included in his proposal.

So when the hearings are held, I hope we shall give consideration at the same time to the President's recommendation,

and that we will move in the direction of his recommendation, which I support. I also hope that we will give consideration to the broadening of authority of a Foreign Trade Division, or whatever instrumentality proposed to be created, so that, in addition to giving away our surpluses, we may arrange to sell them to friendly countries that may have an ample amount of funds in their own currency with which to pay for them. It seems to me that we certainly will have to engage in giving away foodstuffs, simply because at the moment we do not know what to do with the domestic currency of the countries that need food.

We propose to solve that problem by establishing within the Commodity Credit Corporation a clearing house for rendering service in connection with these needs. We can take domestic currency of one country and spend it to the advantage of the United States, either in that country or in some other country having need for such currency. I hope with the Senator from Vermont that, when the hearings are held, we shall be able to go into the whole field.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say that the message just received clears the way now for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make a thorough study and to have full hearings on the bills which have been introduced by several Senators. I think the Senator from South Dakota introduced the first bill. The Senator from Kansas has introduced a bill, and I think other bills are pending before the committee which have for their objective the improvement of trade in agricultural commodities with foreign countries. Those bills contain provisions with respect to the interchange of currency and several other factors not included in the bill I have just received from the White House, which deals only with commodities actually owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and which authorizes their use outside the United States in friendly nations in which there is distress and great need of assistance.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it should be added that none of the bills which are before our committee would grant to the Commodity Credit Corporation or to the President less authority than he requests in his message. Most of them would grant considerably more authority. So against the threat of accumulating agricultural surpluses we should move with giant steps to dispose of them throughout the world, rather than limiting our activity to countries actually in need, countries that are apparently so impecunious that they can pay nothing at all for their necessary food supplies.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. The White House sent the Pakistan bill to Congress for immediate action, because, among several reasons, there was a critical drought situation in Pakistan having economic, political, and other aspects. The President now asks for authority to deal with any similar situation, should it arise when Congress is not in session, but none of the bills coming from the White House is as broad as the one pending before the committee which was introduced by the Senator from South Dakota. I did not feel like calling hearings

on the subject until we received a message from the White House, because at one time I had the impression that the White House proposal would include much broader measures. Some of them are probably incorporated in the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota. The bill is here now and we shall give early consideration to it and the broader proposals to which several Senators have referred.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator very much for that assurance.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate very much what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has said to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], but I should like to ask if in giving what is almost famine relief in the Southwest all haste will be made as is anticipated will be made in the exportation of foodstuffs to disaster areas of the world.

Each day the drought crisis becomes worse. It is liquidating the breeding stock, the very backbone of the livestock industry in the Southwest. Unless the committee acts speedily to remove the requirements for the sale of surplus agricultural commodities, such as corn and, I believe, cottonseed meal, of which we have a great abundance, at not less than 105 percent of parity, it will not do any good to make it available for cattlemen. They are selling their cattle because there is no feed, and no grass on the range. Should we consider waiving the regulations for sales in drought areas of stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, yesterday the President made immediately available out of his emergency fund several million dollars to be used in relieving the situation caused by the drought in the States of Oklahoma and Texas, and in probably several other States, before the crisis is over.

In the meantime, the Department of Agriculture has been working out its program and expects to have a bill prepared for the Congress to consider sometime today or tomorrow. The allocation by the President tended to carry the situation along until Congress can act. So far as our committee is concerned, we shall meet almost immediately.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. There is in the emergency fund from which the President made an allocation yesterday a free balance of more than \$18 million, so he can make additional allocations up until the time the fund is exhausted. I am confident the President will make funds available, and that in the meantime we can act not only on this emergency legislation, but on any additional appropriation which the President will need for his emergency fund.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I hope the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will give the President adequate funds. I consider

that even \$18 million, if it is available, is merely a starter to relieve the distress which has resulted from 4 years of continued drought in Texas and 2 years in Oklahoma which is threatening the livestock business with bankruptcy.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me assure the Senator from Oklahoma that the administration will ask for an adequate fund. The money allocated yesterday by the President is simply a stopgap allocation until the Congress can pass the necessary legislation. I think the Senator from Oklahoma can assure his cattlemen that feed will be sent into the areas where the cattlemen are out of feed and that credit will be made available so that it will not be necessary to force the cattle into a market which the cattle producers do not want to enter.

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no market existing today for the drought-starved cattle, at any kind of a reasonable price.

Mr. AIKEN. We realize that the forced marketing of cattle in Texas and Oklahoma has had its effect on cattle producers all over the United States. The fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has assured assistance in that area, that work is actually being done toward that end, and that the President has made an interim allocation, evidently has had some effect already and has given new courage to some who were ready to let go. I understand the price has strengthened somewhat yesterday and today.

Mr. MONRONEY. One of the problems is in connection with the corn and the cottonseed which might be made available. If the cattlemen are forced to borrow in order to buy that feed they may just as well liquidate for whatever they can get. They expect to pay the debt to the Government, but, in view of the situation confronting them and the present condition of the market, they cannot afford to borrow money, even if it is a character loan, to feed that high-priced feed to their cattle.

Mr. AIKEN. I think I can assure the Senator from Oklahoma that feed, particularly cottonseed cake, will be furnished those persons who find themselves out of money and out of feed, at a substantial reduction in price. The feed will undoubtedly not be given to those who are amply able to pay for it, but credit will be given, I am sure. I do not want to go into details, because I do not know all the details, but, in a general way, assistance will be sent to the Southwest, and I sincerely hope that the livestock producers will try to hold on a few days longer. There may be an adequate rain. Six inches of rain fell in Texas yesterday.

Mr. MONRONEY. One one-hundredth of an inch fell in Oklahoma.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, what is needed is a complete examination of the entire problem which confronts the southwestern area of the United States. I am confident the Secretary of Agriculture, having made a trip to that section and having appraised the seriousness of the situation, will make some positive recommendations.

In my opinion, what is needed is an organized effort to remove the young stock from that area into other areas where there is ample pasture. Another thing is to get feed to the matured animals in order to keep them in the area for future breeding purposes.

I am confident that if we take both steps, and Congress acts boldly, we can check the movement of this excellent foundation breeding stock that exists in the Southwest, keep it there, and not have it sent to the slaughter pens in an unfinished condition and sold at a terrific sacrifice.

I am confident the administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the Congress, will act speedily in order to meet the emergency and aid the livestock men in overcoming the dire and drastic situation with which they are faced.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a privileged matter?

Mr. AIKEN. I am ready to quit, if I can.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland, and then I shall yield the floor.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I notice in section 3 of the bill that assistance may be rendered under it through June 30, 1955. Most certainly Congress will be back in session next January. This is a very drastic authority; it is in reality a blank check on all surplus commodities. It seems to me Congress should keep strict control of this type of thing. Why is such a long expiration date provided?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I saw this bill only a short time ago. I am not in position to comment on it. I am sure the matter referred to by the Senator from Maryland will be called to the attention of the committee. Possibly other provisions of the bill will be called to the attention of the committee.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have taken only a very hasty glance at the proposed legislation. The commodities would be taken from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Treasury would then refund the Commodity Credit Corporation the cost of the commodities to the Corporation. In that way we would simply be going through the Treasury of the United States on a blank check basis.

The bill would grant very drastic authority. It is in my opinion authority that Congress should keep tightly in its control. I merely make this as a suggestion to the committee as something that should be looked into.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to have the Senator's interpretation. Funds would also be required in order to carry out the provisions of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. BRICKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator from Florida was first on his feet. Was he asking me to yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes, I was.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly upon the message from the President and the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who is chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

It seems to me that while all of us naturally would have sympathetic interest in a suggestion based on the extension of mercy and generosity to others in distress, at the very inception we ought to take notice of the fact that this suggestion, in effect, invites Congress to delegate its authority to the Executive in a wider way than I think Congress has ever been willing or should be willing to do.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Vermont to the fact that the message states clearly that the program would have been applied to the Pakistan gift, if the proposed act had been in effect and available prior to that time. The transfer of wheat to Pakistan involved a gift of about \$100 million of the funds of this Nation. The message makes it clear that, under this proposal, not only would that transfer have been covered without requiring action by Congress, but that similar proposals may be handled without specific legislation in the future.

The message makes it clear that the measure would obviate or bypass the necessity of bringing any such situations to the attention of Congress in the future, but would, instead, allow their solution to depend solely upon the decision and the act of the Executive. I call particular attention to the fact that the message recites, in addition to what I have suggested, the following, indicating clearly that the standards requiring action must be determined by the sole decision of the Executive:

Since we cannot adequately foresee the specific needs to be met under the legislation I am requesting, we cannot now determine the most effective and equitable conditions under which such assistance may be rendered in a particular situation. Consequently, I am requesting authority to establish, when the need arises, the terms and conditions under which these agricultural commodities shall be made available.

Recognizing, as he should, that such action involves the necessity of reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the President in his message suggests further:

To prevent impairment of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to permit necessary budgetary adjustments, I am recommending an authorization to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent of its investment in commodities furnished by it, plus any other costs, including interest, which it may incur in carrying out programs authorized under this act.

It seems to me that here would be a blanket delegation given by Congress to the President to determine under what conditions such gifts should be made, how large such gifts should be, and then to require the fiscal agency of the Government to pay over the money, no matter how much was involved, to the Commodity Credit Corporation, to prevent

the impairment of the funds of that corporation.

Much as I should like to go along with any program suggested under the idea of the extension of mercy and generosity to a friendly nation and to suffering human beings, it seems to me that we are being asked here to go much further than we can reasonably go.

I suggest again to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that it is almost as serious a matter, if not equally as serious, that this program apparently would key into the support price program of the Nation, which is designed to give substantial benefit and security to agriculture and to agricultural producers, a branch of activity based upon grants, gifts, and a disposal of surpluses at the will of one person, no matter how well disposed or how wise or merciful he may be. I think that such a provision would impair greatly the stability of the agricultural price support program, and the confidence of our people in that program. It occurs to me that the whole proposal needs very careful study, because it would, if carried out as suggested here, certainly impair, and perhaps destroy, both the solvency and the stability of our agricultural support program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Florida, I realize that for 15 years many Members of Congress have been very much concerned with trying to curb exaggerated benevolences on the part of the Chief Executive. I point out that the bill, like all proposed legislation, is subject to such limitations as Congress may see fit to impose. I, myself, have not studied the bill. Of course, I have read it, and I know in a general way what it involves. I have not studied the effect of it in detail, but I assure all Senators that the bill will be carefully considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I repeat, it clears the way for consideration of other bills which have been held back out of deference to the Chief Executive.

REPAIR AND REHABILITATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AIRPORTS— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 35) to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

3. ORCHARD LOANS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4158, to extend for 5 years the Secretary's authority to make loans to orchardists (H. Rept. 898) (p. 9752).
4. WATER COMPACT. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 1197, granting consent of Congress to a water compact between Nebr., Wyo., and S. Dak. (H. Rept. 896) (p. 9752).
5. RUBBER. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 5728, to authorize disposal of Government-owned rubber plants (p. 9747).
6. TAXATION; GRAIN STORAGE FACILITIES. Passed without amendment H. R. 6426, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the time during which certain provisions relating to income and estate taxes shall apply (pp. 9704-8). Rep. Martin, Iowa, spoke favoring section 206, which would allow an income-tax deduction for the amortization of farm-storage facilities built in calendar year 1953, and in the 3 succeeding calendar years. (p. 9708.)
7. FOOD STANDARDS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 6434, to amend the Food and Drug Act, relating to food standards (p. D755).
8. CLAIMS. Received this Department's report of tort claims paid for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953; to the Judiciary Committee (p. 9752).
9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states the House will act on the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill Thursday, July 23 (p. D753).

SENATE

10. APPROPRIATIONS. Debated H. R. 5969, the Defense appropriation bill for 1954 (pp. 9760-828).
11. FAMINE RELIEF; FARM SURPLUS. The "Daily Digest" states: the Agriculture and Forestry Committee "tentatively agreed to report with amendments S. 2249, to make agricultural commodities available to friendly countries to assist in famine and other urgent relief (special subcommittee was appointed to draft language for amendments approved today)"; and "appointed a subcommittee to draft a bill for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities" (p. D752).
12. FOREIGN TRADE. The Finance Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 5877, the customs simplification bill. The "Daily Digest" states that the bill as ordered reported includes an amendment to allow the Secretary of Treasury to adopt the standards for length of staple established by USDA on imported cotton (p. D752).
13. CLAIMS. Received from this Department a report on tort claims paid by USDA for the period July 1, 1952 to June 30, 1953 (p. 9755).
14. TREATIES. Sen. Knowland submitted an amendment in the form of a substitute to S. J. Res. 1, proposing a constitutional amendment to limit the treaty-making power, and Sen. Wiley inserted the President's statement and his own discussing this amendment (pp. 9757-8).
15. DROUGHT RELIEF. Sen. Daniel discussed the drought situation in the Southwest and the need to develop better programs to combat such situations on the basis of joint Federal-State effort (pp. 9829-30).

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 23, 1953
For actions of July 22, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 137

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	1,2,9,10	Farm surplus.....	11	Personnel.....	22
Butter.....	18	Food standards.....	7	Postal rates.....	26
Claims.....	8,13	Foreign aid.....	2,24	Prices, support.....	18,25
Conservation.....	18	Grain storage facilities.....	6	Rubber.....	5
Cotton.....	12,25	Hawaii statehood.....	21	St. Lawrence Seaway.....	19
Customs simplification.....	12	Lands.....	17	Surplus property.....	16
Drought relief.....	15	Legislative program.....	9	Taxation.....	6
Education.....	26	Loans, farm.....	3,20	Technical assistance.....	2
Electrification.....	23	Loans, orchard.....	3	Trade, foreign.....	12,25
Famine relief.....	11	Loans, water facilities.....	20	Treaties.....	14
Farm policy.....	18	Minerals.....	17	Water compact.....	4

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on Agricultural appropriation bill. House passed foreign-aid appropriation bill. House committee reported orchard-loans bill. House passed grain-storage facilities tax-amortization bill. Senate debated defense appropriation bill. Senate committee tentatively agreed to report famine-relief bill. Senate committee ordered reported customs simplification bill with imported cotton standards amendment.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. House received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 5227 (pp. 9708-10). Attached to this Digest are statements pertaining to this measure.

2. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 288-111, with amendment, H. R. 6391, the mutual security appropriation bill for 1954 (pp. 9712-47).

Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Vorys increasing by \$5 million the funds for technical assistance to Latin American countries (pp. 9737-8).

Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Judd to increase by \$12 million the funds for technical assistance to the Near East and Africa (pp. 9733-5).

By Rep. Judd to increase by \$19 million funds for technical assistance and defense support for Asia and the Pacific (pp. 9735-7).

By Rep. Javits to increase by \$7.5 million the funds for multilateral technical assistance (pp. 9739-40).

By Rep. Coudert to put a \$5.5 billion limitation on the 1954 expenditures of the Mutual Security Administration (pp. 9741-5).

By Rep. Budge to hold the 1954 obligations to the 1953 expenditures (p. 9745).

As passed this bill provides appropriations of \$4,433,678,000 (\$705,224,277 below the revised estimates) plus a \$1,758,000,000 of unobligated carryover for 1954; a total available as of July 1, of \$6,191,000,000.

House conferees were appointed on H. R. 4828, the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1954 (p. 9710). Senate conferees were appointed June 26.

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FAMINE RELIEF, AND COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS AND MARKETING QUOTAS

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee met in executive session, after which it announced the following actions:

(1) Tentatively agreed to report with amendments S. 2249, to make agricultural commodities available to friendly countries to assist in famine or other urgent relief (special subcommittee was appointed to draft language for amendments approved today);

(2) Appointed a subcommittee to draft a bill for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities; and

(3) Considered, but took no action on, S. 2106 and S. 2183, both relating to cotton marketing quotas and acreage allotments. Committee will meet again tomorrow to consider further these bills, as well as new language of amendments adopted today to S. 2249.

APPROPRIATIONS—SUPPLEMENTAL

Committee on Appropriations: Committee continued its hearings on H. R. 6200, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, with testimony, as indicated, from the following witnesses, who were accompanied by their associates:

On Commerce Department items—Secretary Weeks on defense production activities, Under Secretary for Transportation Murray on operating differential subsidies, Maritime Administration, and Loring K. Macy, Acting Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, on export controls;

On Interior Department items—Under Secretary Ralph A. Tudor on defense production activities, and William C. Strand, Director, Office of Territories, on Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

On funds for miscellaneous Government commissions—Rowland Hughes, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget;

On funds for Subversive Activities Control Board—Harry P. Cain, member of the Board; and

On civil functions item—Brig. Gen. C. H. Chorpening, Chief of Army Engineers for Civil Works.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

MILITARY PUBLIC WORKS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Real Estate and Military Construction held hearings on S. 2361, to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, with testimony from Under Secretary of the Air Force Douglas, Frank R. Creedon, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, and representatives from the Departments of the Army and Navy. Hearings continue tomorrow.

CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION, VETERANS' TAX EXEMPTIONS, AND THEATER TAX

Committee on Finance: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the following:

With amendments H. R. 5877, to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 (Customs Simplification Act of 1953), (amendments would (1) delete from the bill (a) section 15 on dutiable value, (b) section 22 on conversion of currency, and (c) section 7 (b) relating to reimportation of metal products exported and changed in value, and (2) would add to the bill (a) a clarifying amendment to section 11 (c) relating to duty-free use of materials used as dunnage for cargo when being used for temporary devices for control of ship cargo, and (b) an amendment to section 5 to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to adopt the standards for length of staple established by the Secretary of Agriculture on imported cotton);

With an amendment H. R. 4152, extending for 1 year the existing income-tax exemptions on the income of members of the Armed Forces who served in a combat zone or were hospitalized because of injuries incurred during such service (the amendment would allow income-tax deduction for dependent child who cannot be legally adopted due to mental incompetency of the mother); and

Without amendment H. R. 157, to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater.

MARITIME SUBSIDIES

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Special Subcommittee continued its hearings on maritime subsidies, with testimony from Daniel Strohmeier, vice president, Bethlehem Steel Co. (Shipbuilding Division), New York City. The witness stated that unless we take steps soon to build up the industry in all regards, it faces a deterioration to a dangerous degree.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Trading With the Enemy approved for reporting to the full committee S. 373, to extend the time for filing claims for the return of property under the Trading With the Enemy Act, S. 2231, to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act relating to debt claims, and S. 2315, to authorize payment of certain war claims.

Also, subcommittee held hearings on these and other bills to amend this act, with testimony, as indicated, from the following witnesses:

Favoring S. 249 was Senator Bennett;

Favoring S. J. Res. 92 were Senator Chavez and Delegate Farrington; and

Favoring S. 155 was former Senator Scott Lucas.

Also testifying on these and other related bills were numerous outside witnesses.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate began consideration of Defense appropriation bill.

House passed mutual security appropriations.

Senate Finance Committee approved customs simplification bill and two tax bills.

House committees approved bills on Territorial education, interstate carriers, and food standards.

Conferees filed report on Agriculture appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 9754-9760, 9829

Bills Introduced: 8 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2443 to S. 2450; and S. Res. 148.

Pages 9757, 9829

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 32, to increase limit on subsistence expenses allowed Federal judges while traveling, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles, with amendments (S. Rept. 608);

S. 2417, to provide for the creation of a Commission on Judicial and Congressional Salaries, with amendments (S. Rept. 609);

H. R. 4152, extending for 1 year the existing income-tax exemptions on the income of members of the Armed Forces who served in a combat zone or were hospitalized because of injuries incurred during such service, with amendment (S. Rept. 610); and

H. R. 157, to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to a moving-picture theater (S. Rept. 611).

Page 9757

Bills Referred: 29 House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committee.

Page 9758

Defense Appropriations: Senate considered H. R. 5969, Defense appropriations for fiscal year 1954, taking the following actions on amendments:

Adopted: All committee amendments, subject to later reconsideration; and

Rejected: By 25 yeas to 62 nays, Saltonstall motion to eliminate committee amendment barring funds for defense contracts to correct or prevent economic dislocations.

Pending at recess was Maybank amendment to increase by \$400 million funds for Air Force.

Pages 9760-9828

Alaska Land Leases: Senate agreed to hold conference on H. R. 1802, relative to leasing Alaskan lands which have been reserved for educational purposes, and have been found to contain oil, gas, and coal deposits, and appointed as conferees Senators Butler (Nebraska), Dworshak, Barrett, Murray, and Clements.

Page 9829

Confirmations: The nominations of Joseph Simonson, of Minnesota, to be Ambassador to Ethiopia, and of Jesse D. Locker, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to Liberia, were confirmed, along with 2 other civilian nominations, and 700 in the Army, 272 in the Air Force, 17 in the Navy, and 3 in the Marine Corps.

Pages 9830-9831

Nominations: 121 civilian nominations were received, including those of Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah, to be Ambassador to Greece, and to serve concurrently as Chief of American Mission for Aid to Greece, and Raymond A. Hare, of Iowa, to be Ambassador to Lebanon.

Page 9830

Program for Thursday: Senate recessed at 9:54 p. m. until noon Thursday, July 23, when it will continue on H. R. 5969, Defense appropriations for 1954, to be followed during day and balance of week, not necessarily in order listed, by H. R. 2824, encourage production of tungsten ores, S. J. Res. 96, Commission on International Telecommunications, S. Res. 147, citing Harvey O'Connor for contempt of Senate, H. R. 4484, amend D. C. law as to maximum cost of certain funerals, H. J. Res. 228, immigration of refugee orphans, S. 711, C. & O. Canal easements, H. R. 2236, D. C. area problems, H. R. 2828, Menominee Indians, and H. R. 157, admission tax exemption.

2. FCA REORGANIZATION. Reps. Hope, Anderson, Hill, Cooley, and Poage were appointed conferees on H. R. 4353, to reorganize FCA, etc. (p. 9984).
3. BUILDINGS. Passed without amendment H. R. 6342, to authorize GSA to acquire real property and to provide for construction of public buildings thereon by executing purchase contracts (pp. 9989-10004).
4. DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 5969 (p. 9979).
5. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 4551, to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 removing authorization of projects by the Interior Department (H. Rept. 933)(p. 10038).
6. SMALL BUSINESS. Received the conference report on H. R. 5141, to create a Small Business Administration, to replace the RFC (pp. 10029-34, D773).
7. REORGANIZATION. The Government Operations Committee reported/without amendment H. Res. 263, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 9 of 1953, providing for a reorganized Council of Economic Advisors (p. 10038).
8. FOOD INSPECTION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6434, to simplify procedures for establishment of food standards by the Food and Drug Administration (H. Rept. 934)(p. 10038).
9. BUDGETING. The Government Operations Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 2, to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed revenues except in time of war or national emergency declared by Congress (p. D771).
10. SURPLUS PROPERTY. The Government Operations Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 6382, to extend until June 30, 1954, the period during which GSA may conduct negotiated sales of surplus property (p. D771).
11. FOREIGN TRADE. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) S. Con. Res. 40, declaring it the sense of Congress that export containers be marked with the words "United States of America" (p. D771).
12. ADJOURNED until Mon., July 27 (p. 10037). Legislative program as announced by Rep. Halleck: Mon., Consent and Private Calendars; Tues., immigration bill; then (if reported) foreign-relief and other bills. Rep. Halleck said, "I am confident we can dispose of the matters next week that are before us." (pp. 10028-9.)

SENATE

13. FOREIGN RELIEF. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 2249, to authorize CCC to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the U. S. (S. Rept. 631)(p. 10046).
The Committee reported without amendment H. 2475, to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the U. S. (S. Rept. 642)(p. 10048).
14. CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION BILL. The Finance Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 5877 (S. Rept. 632)(p. 10046).

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 27, 1953
For actions of July 24, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 139

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	12	Food inspection.....	8	Prices, support.....	32
Appropriations....	1,4,18,19	Foreign aid.....	13,28	Property, surplus.....	10
Budgeting.....	9	Forestry.....	24	Reorganization.....	2,7,25
Buildings.....	3	Grain storage.....	17	Small business.....	6
Contracts.....	21	Hawaii.....	31	Statistics.....	15
Cotton.....	30	Legislative program...	12,20	T.V.A.....	22
Customs simplification..	14,20	Loans, farm.....	1,2	Trade, foreign	
Drought relief.....	1,33	Personnel.....	16		11,13,14,20,27,32
Economic advisers.....	7	Prices, cattle.....	26	Treaties.....	29

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed drought-relief appropriation bill. Senate committees reported foreign-relief and customs-simplification bills. Senate rejected conference report on 1st independent offices appropriation bill. House sent FCA-reorganization bill to conference. Senate passed lease-purchase bill for buildings. Sens. Murray and Humphrey criticized USDA for not providing more storage facilities.

HOUSE

1. DROUGHT-RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 305, which had been reported by the Appropriations Committee earlier in the day (H. Rept. 922) (pp. 9983-8). Rejected an amendment by Rep. Mahon to increase from \$20,000,000 to \$40,000,000 the amount for FHA loans under title 2 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (pp. 9987-8).

The committee report states: "The committee recommends the full estimate of \$150,000,000, of which \$130,000,000 is added to the Disaster Loan Revolving Fund, and \$20,000,000 is authorized for regular production and subsistence loans under the Farmer's Home Administration. Of the funds proposed for the Disaster Loan Revolving Fund, \$30,000,000 is provided for economic disaster loans under Section 2 (b) of the Act, \$60,000,000 is allowed for special livestock loans under Section 2 (c)..., and \$40,000,000 is recommended to cover costs incurred in furnishing emergency feed and seed assistance to farmers under Section 2 (d)..

"...Removal of the minimum loan limitation of \$2,500 for loans under Section 2 (c)...is proposed. The committee feels that denial of loans of less than \$2,500 outside of disaster areas will work a severe hardship on small farmers...

"The committee feels strongly that the regular Farmers' Home Administration offices and personnel should be used... It questions the need for additional committees or other special groups..."

EMERGENCY FAMINE ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY

JULY 24 (legislative day, JULY 6), 1953.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 2249]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2249) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States, having considered same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

S. 2249 was introduced pursuant to the request of the President, set out herein as exhibit A. Its purpose is to enable him to furnish emergency assistance in the form of agricultural commodities to friendly peoples suffering from famine or other urgent relief problems. Several times during past years Congress and the President have acted, and acted promptly, in extending such assistance; and Congress is prepared promptly to consider recommendations for assistance in the future. This authority may be especially necessary when Congress is not in session. As introduced, the bill contained a termination date of June 30, 1955, but your committee felt that a termination date of March 15, 1954, would cover the period Congress will not be in session and a sufficient period after Congress meets again.

In view of the shortness of the period for which the bill would be effective and the fact that Congress will be in session for a considerable period before the bill's termination date, it was felt that \$100 million would be sufficient to take care of any emergencies which might occur, and the assistance which may be furnished under the bill would consequently be limited to that sum by committee amendment. Some consideration was given to limiting the amount available for assistance to any one country, but situations as to need, size of population, and other factors would vary so greatly that the committee felt this must be left to the discretion and wisdom of the President.

As introduced, the bill provided for assistance to friendly nations.

The committee feared that this might restrict it to peoples whose governments are friendly, whereas the real purpose of the bill is also to help those of good will who need our help and have our sympathy. The committee amendment in this regard would make it clear assistance may be furnished to friendly populations if it can be assured that the assistance will reach them.

The committee realizes that the furnishing of assistance of this sort must necessarily have some effect on the economy of the recipient country, as well as exporting countries, commercial suppliers and others. The desire of the committee is simply to furnish aid on behalf of our Nation to those in need, and such aid should be furnished in such manner as to avoid all possible injury to the domestic economy of any friendly country or the channels of commercial trade. To the maximum extent practicable consistent with good business practices and the purposes of the act, the normal channels of trade should be utilized in carrying out the act.

In order that Congress may be fully advised on the manner in which any programs under the bill may be working the committee intends to request a full report thereon shortly after Congress convenes in January.

EXHIBIT A

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD GIVE AUTHORITY TO UTILIZE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES HELD BY THIS GOVERNMENT TO MEET NEEDS ARISING FROM FAMINE OR OTHER URGENT RELIEF REQUIREMENTS

To the Congress of the United States:

Because of the great productivity of our farms, the people of the United States have been able, on several occasions in recent years, to come to the aid of friendly countries faced with famine. In 1951 agricultural supplies were provided to India, and only recently wheat has been made available to the people of Pakistan. In both instances we were able to provide assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements by using stocks of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. On each of these occasions the Congress has been forced to add consideration of these emergency programs to its very heavy workload. This procedure not only adds to the congressional burden but also slows the speed with which this Government can come to the assistance of a nation urgently needing relief.

I therefore believe it advisable to have general legislation which, within appropriate limitations, would permit the President to meet these situations. The legislation I am requesting would give the President the authority to utilize agricultural commodities held by this Government, but it would limit that authority to meet only the occasional needs arising from famine or other urgent relief requirements.

The objectives of such a program are not to be confused with the principal objective of our mutual security program. The mutual security program aims at promoting the long-range security of the United States by assisting our friends to strengthen their long-range economic and defensive capabilities. The program I am now proposing aims at mitigating the hard blows of unusual and urgent emergencies.

Since we cannot adequately foresee the specific needs to be met under the legislation I am requesting, we cannot now determine the most effective and equitable conditions under which such assistance may be rendered in a particular situation. Consequently, I am requesting authority to establish, when the need arises, the terms and conditions under which these agricultural commodities shall be made available.

In order that there may be a minimum of delay in assisting nations stricken with famine or having other urgent relief requirements, I am requesting that the Commodity Credit Corporation be given authority to make available from its stocks the necessary agricultural commodities to meet these emergency needs.

To prevent impairment of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to permit necessary budgetary adjustments, I am recommending an authorization to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent of its investment in commodities furnished by it, plus any other costs, including interest, which it may incur in carrying out programs authorized under this act. When the costs of any programs carried out under terms of this act can be ascertained the Congress will be asked to appropriate the necessary funds to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. I further propose that the authority to undertake programs of famine and other urgent relief assistance under this legislation expire on June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1953.*



Calendar No. 633

83D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2249

[Report No. 631]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 30 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1953

Mr. AIKEN introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

JULY 24 (legislative day, JULY 6), 1953

Reported by Mr. AIKEN, with amendments

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and
4 directed to make available to the President, out of stocks of
5 agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit
6 Corporation through price-support operations, such agri-
7 cultural commodities as may be requested by the President
8 for transfer to any nation friendly to the United States in

1 order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of
2 such nation. The President may make such transfer through
3 such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and
4 conditions as he deems appropriate.

5 SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the
6 Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of
7 hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated
8 to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in
9 the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are
10 equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities,
11 including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making
12 deliveries hereunder. Any assets available to the Commodity
13 Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such appro-
14 priations or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this
15 Act.

16 SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken
17 under the authority of this Act after June 30, 1955.

18 *That, in order to enable the President to furnish emergency*
19 *assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to*
20 *friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent relief re-*
21 *quirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized*
22 *and directed to make available to the President out of its stocks*
23 *such agricultural commodities as he may request for transfer*
24 *(1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to*
25 *meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation*

1 and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to
2 the friendliness of their government providing that such
3 commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress
4 among such populations. Not more than \$100,000,000 (in-
5 cluding the Corporation's investment in the commodities)
6 shall be expended for all transfers under this section. The
7 President may make such transfer through such agencies, in
8 such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he
9 deems appropriate.

10 SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the
11 Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of
12 hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to
13 the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the
14 Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal
15 to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including
16 handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries
17 hereunder. Any assets available to the Commodity Credit
18 Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriations
19 or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

20 SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken
21 under the authority of this Act after March 15, 1954.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements."

A BILL

To authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

By Mr. AIKEN

JUNE 30 (legislative day, JUNE 27), 1953

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

JULY 24 (legislative day, JULY 6), 1953

Reported with amendments

on this bill, H. R. 4828, and acted on amendments which had been reported in disagreement (pp. 10308-23, 10162-72). This bill will now be sent to the President.

6. **FAMINE RELIEF.** Passed as reported S. 2249, to enable the President, during the period ending Mar. 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the U. S. emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements (pp. 10279-301). Under the modified bill, the aid would be limited to 100,000,000.
7. **CONTRACTS.** The Finance Committee reported with amendments H. R. 6237, to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (S. Rept. 643)(p. 10231).
8. **PERSONNEL.** The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments S. 2451, to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference to disabled veterans for Federal employment (S. Rept. 679)(p. 10323).
9. **FEDERAL REGISTER.** Passed without amendment H. R. 1806, to provide statutory authority for publication by the Administrative Committee on the Federal Register from time to time as deemed necessary (p. 10264). This bill will now be sent to the President.
10. **STATISTICS.** Passed without amendment S. 2348, to repeal the authority for collection and publication of red-cedar shingles by the Census Bureau (p. 10266).
11. **REORGANIZATION.** The Vice President appointed Sen. Ferguson, Sen. McClellan, S. C. Hollister, and Robert G. Storey to the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (p. 10231).
12. **SAFETY.** Senate conferees were appointed on S. 1105, to incorporate the National Safety Council (pp. 10301-2).
13. **SUGAR.** Ratified Executive L, prolonging the international agreement regarding production and marketing of sugar (pp. 10302-8).
14. **REPORT.** Both Houses received from the President a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems (H. Doc. 214) (pp. 10238, 10144).
15. **FARM PROGRAM.** Sen. Langer inserted various local statements on the present status of the farm program, etc. (pp. 10239, 10246-7).
16. **POULTRY.** Sen. Bridges inserted resolutions from the N. H. Poultry Growers Assn. (pp. 10240-1).
17. **WATER CONSERVATION.** Sen. Johnson, Tex., spoke in favor of developing Texas water resources (pp. 10245).

HOUSE

18. **FAMINE RELIEF.** The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6016, to make CCC commodities available to the President to meet famine or other urgent relief needs in friendly foreign countries (H. Rept. 983)(p. 10228).
19. **FORESTRY LOANS.** The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment H. R. 5603, to authorize national banking associations to make loans on forest tracts (H. Rept. 969)(p. 10228).
20. **FOREIGN TRADE.** The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued July 28, 1953
For actions of July 27, 1953
83rd-1st, No. 141*

CONTENTS		(*No items of interest in No. 140)
Agricultural	Federal Register.....9	Postal rates.....43,46
appropriations.....54	Foreign aid.....1,47	Poultry.....16
Appropriations	Forestry.....10,19,27	Property.....22,38
.....1,2,31,47,54	Foundations.....37	Reports.....14
Banking and currency.....14,32	Immigration.....23,52	Rubber.....33
Budgeting.....22	Investigations.....37	Safety.....12
Claims.....41	Lands, forest.....27	Small business.....36
Contracts.....7	public.....21	Statehood.....49
Credit unions.....35	reclamation.....21	Statistics.....10
Customs simplification...4	transfer.....28	Sugar.....13
Drought relief.....2,53	Loans, farm.....29	Taxation.....24
Electrification.....26,51	Minerals.....27,42	Trade, foreign ..20,45,50
Famine relief.....6,18	Organization,	Veterans' benefits....8,30
Farm labor.....48	executive.....11,34,39	Water compact.....25
Farm loans.....29	Payrolling.....24	Water conservation.....17
Farm program.....15	Personnel....8,24,30,40,55	Wool.....44

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed famine-relief and customs-simplification bills. Senate committee reported foreign-aid, drought-relief, and supplemental appropriation bills. Senate ratified sugar-agreement continuation. Both Houses received President's recommendation for Korea aid. Both Houses agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill. House passed orchard-loans bill. House committees reported bills on famine relief, public-for-private timber-land exchange, and banking loans on forest tracts. President signed agricultural appropriation bill. House received conference reports on 1st-independent-offices and Labor-HEW appropriation bills.

SENATE

1. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses received the President's message recommending appropriation of \$200 million for rehabilitation and economic support of Korea (H. Doc. 215); to Appropriations Committees (pp. 10144-5, 10238).

The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 6391, the foreign-aid appropriation bill (S. Rept. 645)(p. 10231). Sens. Bridges and McCarthy submitted amendments which they intend to propose to this bill (pp. 10242-3, 10247-9).

Sen. Wiley spoke in favor of continuation of the International Children's Emergency Fund (pp. 10247-9).

2. DROUGHT-RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendment H. J. Res. 305, the drought-relief appropriation bill (S. Rept. 646)(p. 10241).

3. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 6200 (S. Rept. 677)(p. 10241). Sen. Bridges submitted amendments which he intends to offer to the bill (p. 10323).

4. CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 5877, the customs-simplification bill (pp. 10268-79).

5. INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Both Houses agreed to the conference report

83^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 2249

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 28, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

AN ACT

To enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, in order to enable the President to furnish emergency
4 assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to
5 friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent relief re-
6 quirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized
7 and directed to make available to the President out of its
8 stocks such agricultural commodities as he may request for
9 transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in

1 order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of
2 such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations with-
3 out regard to the friendliness of their government providing
4 that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve
5 actual distress among such populations. Not more than
6 \$100,000,000 (including the Corporation's investment in the
7 commodities) shall be expended for all transfers under this
8 section. The President may make such transfer through
9 such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and con-
10 ditions as he deems appropriate.

11 SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the
12 Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of
13 hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to
14 the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the
15 Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal
16 to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including
17 handling costs, plus the cost incurred in making deliveries
18 hereunder. Any assets available to the Commodity Credit
19 Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriations
20 or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

21 SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken
22 under the authority of this Act after March 15, 1954.

Passed the Senate July 27, 1953.

Attest:

J. MARK TRICE,

Secretary.

AN ACT

To enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements.

JULY 28, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

at that time I placed a table in the RECORD showing the different values of the peso in Chile in terms of the American dollar.

There was a suggestion in the House bill that we use the export value. That provision, luckily, was eliminated. A country such as Chile, which has 7 different values of the peso, the value ranging from 19.37 to 127 pesos to the dollar, depending on the purpose for which they want to use the peso.

The official value was 31 pesos, having no relation whatever to the real value of the peso.

That is the same way in which almost every nation in the world manipulates its currency for trade advantage. It is because of these things that it is almost impossible for America to trade upon any equal basis.

The tariff represents a differential of cost of production due for the most part to the difference in the wage standard of living here and abroad. The members of the Senate Finance Committee had only a short time to consider this intricate proposed legislation. I believe that upon mature consideration we would find a fishhook in almost every paragraph.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not desire to discuss the merits of the amendment, but when we received the bill the committee went through it with a great deal of care. We eliminated section 15, for instance, which has to do with the valuation section of the tariff act. It affects duties. It might or might not adversely affect American enterprises, but we recognize that it was an intricate problem which had engaged Congress in all previous tariff-making for the past 50 years.

We eliminated section 15. We eliminated section 22 of the bill as it came from the House, in connection with the valuation of currencies, because that also was intricate and difficult to understand without lengthy hearings and without a most careful evaluation of the evidence on that question.

On this particular amendment we acted precisely from the same general motive, to wit, that if we did not strike certain language which we were advised went into the House bill from the House floor, we would be almost compelled to call witnesses who wished to be heard, and it would take considerable time to deal fairly and justly with that amendment.

For that reason, and for the same reason that section 15 is out and section 22 is out, on the question of currency valuation, this amendment was made by the committee.

I earnestly hope the Senate will sustain the committee on this amendment, so that we may at least hope to get a quick conference agreement with the House conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I request a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5877) was read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 247. An act for the relief of Frans Gunnink;

S. 385. An act for the relief of Anna Soleniani;

S. 754. An act for the relief of Ethel Hudson Morrison;

S. 781. An act for the relief of Dr. Jacob Griffel;

S. 815. An act for the relief of Steven M. Pivnicki;

S. 873. An act to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act;

S. 953. An act for the relief of Mary Thalla Womack Webb;

S. 1197. An act granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation by the States of Nebraska, Wyoming, and South Dakota of certain compacts with respect to the use of waters common to two or more of said States;

S. 1273. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American University," approved February 24, 1893, so as to clarify the relations between the Board of Trustees of the American University and the Board of Education of the Methodist Church, and for other purposes;

S. 1393. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949;

S. 1791. An act for the relief of Leong Walk Hong; and

S. 1945. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia", approved March 5, 1952.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred G. Kates and Ronald Kates; and

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of Annelese Schillings.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2824) to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tungsten ores, and concentrates in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1802) to amend the act of Congress approved March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214), as amended.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of

the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4828) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 16, 17, 25, 27, 42, and 47 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 20, 26, 29, 51, and 57, to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF SEPTEMBER 3, 1935, RELATING TO MENOMINEE INDIAN TRIBE OF WISCONSIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2828) to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. WATKINS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. SMATHERS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5877) be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

Second. That in the engrossment of the amendments of the Senate to the bill the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make such changes in section, subsection, paragraph, and so forth, numbers and letters and cross-references thereto as may be necessary to the proper numbering and lettering of the bill.

Third. That the Secretary of the Senate make proper amendments to the table of contents to make the table conform to the bill and that all changes in the table of contents be embodied in one amendment and treated as the last numbered amendment.

ASSISTANCE IN MEETING FAMINE OR URGENT RELIEF NEEDS IN FRIENDLY COUNTRIES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 633, S. 2249, a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in order to enable the President to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President out of its stocks such agricultural commodities as he may request for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations. Not more than \$100 million (including the Corporation's investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all transfers under this section. The President may make such transfers through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriations or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this act after March 15, 1954.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate I desire to announce that when we have concluded action on the unfinished business, Calendar 633, Senate bill 2249, I expect to request another quorum call, and then to call up the two treaties on the Executive Calendar. So far as I am aware, there is no controversy regarding the treaties.

Following action on the treaties, it is planned to have the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, because, at the request of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the consideration of the emergency refugee legislation has been postponed until tomorrow.

Tomorrow it is proposed to take up the military public works bill, which has been reported by the Committee on Armed Services, and the emergency refugee bill. There may be other bills to be considered, but I shall make announcement as to them later in the day.

Although I had previously announced that the legislative appropriation bill would be taken up tomorrow, it will not be ready to be taken up until Wednesday.

Again I say that it is proposed that the Senate shall meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

It is proposed to have the Senate meet at 10 o'clock on Wednesday morning. At that time we shall take up, first, the legislative appropriation bill, which will be followed by the mutual aid appropriation bill. I hope that by Wednesday there will also be available the conference report on the Continental Shelf bill.

On Thursday morning the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock, and take up the supplemental appropriation bill, which will be the last of the appropriation bills necessary to clear both Houses before adjournment. I hope it will be possible to take up also by Thursday the conference report on the reciprocal trade bill.

That will leave Friday reasonably clear for some proposed legislation which may be reported by committees by that time, still with the target of sine die adjournment by midnight on Friday.

As I have mentioned, when we conclude with the bill which has been made the unfinished business, we shall proceed to take up the two treaties.

I call the attention of the minority leader to the fact that it is proposed to take up two additional bills which are on the calendar, one today, the other probably tomorrow.

Calendar 643, Senate bill 2475, a bill to authorize the President to use agricultural commodities to improve the foreign relations of the United States, and for other purposes, will probably not be called up until tomorrow.

There is also an additional measure, Senate Resolution 150, reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, relative to disarmament. Those two measures I hope to call up tomorrow when the Senate convenes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Aiken bill and the emergency food aid bill are disposed of this afternoon, may I ask the distinguished majority leader if it is proposed to proceed then with Calendar No. 643, Senate bill 2475, and Calendar No. 623, Senate Resolution 150?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. After we have concluded with the unfinished business, we shall proceed to the consideration of the treaties on the executive calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And then take a recess?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Except for the conference report on the Interior appropriations bill, which is now at the desk, but which I assured the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I would not call up until I had given notice. I believe there is no major controversy with respect to the conference report, but, in any event, I do not propose to call it up without a quorum call, so that the minority leader may be notified. He has been notified that it is the intention to take up the conference report today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the conference re-

port to which the Senator from California has referred has not yet been received.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand it has been agreed to by the House, and probably will be here by the time the Senate is ready to consider it.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the report is being prepared on the military public-works construction bill. The clerk advises me that it may be an hour before it is ready. I am a little apprehensive, the way the Senate is moving, that it may possibly recess before we have an opportunity to file the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have until midnight tonight to report that bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. CASE. We wish to report a clean print. That is ready and can be presented at any time. It is a revision of Senate bill 2361. We thought it would save the time of the Senate if, instead of having a great many perfecting amendments, we had a clean print. So we wish to report that as a substitute for the military public-works construction bill. We have incorporated in it also the proposed rescission bill, and also the Alaskan communications bill, so it is really three bills in one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only thing I wish to be certain about, as I have assured the Senate heretofore, is that the bill is not taken up until the printed report is available.

Mr. CASE. I think the report will be ready within an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE subsequently said: Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for the Alaska Communication System, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 674) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2491) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for the Alaska Communication System, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

ASSISTANCE IN MEETING FAMINE OR URGENT RELIEF NEEDS IN FRIENDLY COUNTRIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2249) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief

requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, Senate bill 2249 was introduced on June 30, in accordance with the President's message to Congress of that day. As it was originally introduced, it gave broad authority to the President to use any commodities owned or acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation for transfer to any nation friendly to the United States, for the relief of famine or other urgent relief requirements.

It will be recalled that several Members of the Senate objected to the broadness of those provisions at the time the bill was introduced.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry took cognizance of those objections, agreed that they were based upon solid reasoning, and, therefore, approved certain modifications to the bill.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] were instructed to redraft the bill, which they have done in a very effective manner. As the bill now stands before the Senate, I believe it is very sound and workable.

In brief, the bill would authorize the President to use not to exceed \$100 million worth of Commodity Credit Corporation commodities to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements in other countries.

Whereas the original bill had a termination date of June 30, 1955, the committee felt that the bill ought to be placed more upon a trial basis, and we have a cutoff date in the bill of March 15, 1954.

We further adopted the objective of the Flanders amendment, which provides that the President may utilize these commodities for the relief of friendly peoples in nations where possibly the Government itself might not be so friendly—assuming, of course, that it would be possible for those friendly peoples to get the benefit of commodities so contributed by the President.

That, in brief, is the substance of the bill which is before us today. The committee worked cooperatively and unanimously. I see the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is present in the Chamber. He may wish to add something to what I have said. He has certainly been very effective in his contribution toward rewriting the bill. It is in much better form now than it was when it was originally introduced.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Can the Senator from Vermont tell us whether provision has been made for making sure that the recipients of the grain will know where it came from? Will it be plainly marked as having come from us?

Mr. AIKEN. I cannot conceive of the President's contributing any of these commodities unless the people in the recipient countries are advised as to where the agricultural commodities came from.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There have been a great many cases in the past in which people who have received grain and other commodities from the United

States have never been notified as to where the commodities came from.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say that it so happened that the other day I saw a newsreel dealing with this subject. It was on one of the few occasions I have had to attend a motion-picture theater during the entire session of Congress. The newsreel dealt with shipments for Eastern Germany. The markings were very plain. The newsreel showed the distribution of the commodities to large numbers of people who had come over from Eastern Germany to Western Germany for the distribution of the foodstuffs.

Mr. AIKEN. What the Senator from California says is true. I also may add that I have received numerous newspaper clippings from Pakistan during recent days. Apparently the first shipment of wheat to Pakistan has resulted in very fine public relations. The people of Pakistan are undoubtedly aware that the assistance which they are receiving is coming from the United States.

I am confident that the same practice will be followed in the event the President makes commodities available to other countries. It is true that in the past we have had some things put over on us. Commodities were received and credit was given to countries which were not so friendly as they might have been. I do not believe we shall make that mistake again.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Can the Senator from Vermont tell me why it is that the Commodity Credit Corporation should receive full reimbursement for the cost of the commodities to it?

Mr. AIKEN. Because the commodities are now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. If we continue cutting into the Commodity Credit Corporation's borrowing authority and capital for other purposes, the time may come when conceivably it will not have left sufficient money to perform its own functions.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it true that we are cutting into it when we give these commodities away? What would the Commodity Credit Corporation get for them if we did not give them away?

Mr. AIKEN. It is entirely possible that by holding such commodities for a year or two we might receive full value for them, and possibly even make a profit. However, there is no certainty of that.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. What has been our experience in the past in that connection?

Mr. AIKEN. I think we have lost on some commodities mainly of a perishable nature. I think we have made a profit on others. It will be recalled that we had a tremendous stock of cotton when World War II began. The price went up, so that the Government was actually able to dispose of some of that cotton at a profit. We have lost on some commodities from time to time, but in the overall picture there would be a chance

of recovering a considerable part of the investment in such commodities, if not all of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not also true, however, with respect to some perishable commodities that it is possible, particularly where adequate storage facilities are not available, that we might have foodstuffs which would go to waste, and would actually become a complete loss, or almost a complete loss, to the Commodity Credit Corporation? Does not the distinguished Senator feel that in this day and age, when people all over the world are going hungry, it would be nothing short of sinful should we permit a wastage of foodstuffs which might be used by the President in a program such as this, under proper limitations?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. We always lose some perishable commodities, whether or not they are owned by the Government. It would seem to be sinful, as the Senator from California has suggested, to have perishable commodities spoil in this country, when friendly people in the rest of the world are desperately in need of them. It would be better to have the friendly people utilize the commodities than to have them spoil in our country. It must be remembered that the other countries do not think too kindly of the United States when they read about vast amounts of commodities spoiling, after the kind of overproduction we have, which is something of a myth to them anyway.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I agree with what the Senator says. I did not want anything I said to be interpreted as an objection to the bill. I wanted the Senator to point out why it is necessary, if we are giving the commodities away, to cover to the Commodity Credit Corporation the value of the commodities, when manifestly they cannot bring such an amount on the commodity market.

Mr. AIKEN. The main purpose of this bill is to provide emergency, famine relief to suffering people in stricken areas; the cost of this should not be charged to agriculture or against the price-support program. The purpose of the price-support program is to assure us an abundance of production in this country and to maintain our national agricultural economy. The Commodity Credit Corporation must have sufficient borrowing authority with which to do the job.

Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. AIKEN. I see the distinguished Senator from Florida has risen. He has had a great deal to do with the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall ask to have the floor in my own right.

Mr. AIKEN. I want the Senator from Florida to have all the time he needs. If the Senator does not wish to ask me a question I shall yield now to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There has recently come to my attention a clipping from the St. Paul Sunday Pioneer, of July 5, 1953. The article is entitled "Wheat Gift to India Promoted Friendship." The Senator from Vermont referred to Pakistan, and our gift of wheat to that country. That gift had a tremendous psychological effect.

I read from the article I have in my hand:

ANOKA, MINN., July 4.—United States shipments of wheat to India during the recent famine did much to promote friendly relations between the peoples of the two nations, an Indian physician said here today.

Dr. I. R. Bazliel, medical director of the hospital at Simla, India, spoke at opening sessions of the 79th annual statewide Seventh Day Adventist conference on the church campgrounds.

Dr. Bazliel credited the gift of American wheat with "turning the tables in the attitude of my people concerning the west."

I feel that the inquiry of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is very appropriate in terms of whether the recipient countries know who the donor of the gift is. In view of our experiences in the past we can certainly rely upon the President and the Mutual Security Administrator to make certain that proper acknowledgment is given. The spirit in which the gift is now being tendered is in itself as great as the gift.

I commend the committee for reporting the bill. The use of food to relieve hunger in other nations is one of the most powerful adjuncts of our foreign policy, not only as strengthening our foreign policy, but as expressing the spirit of the American people. We are known for our compassion and generosity, and we ought to keep that fact primarily and foremost in our thinking and actions. The pending bill does just that.

I am very pleased to know that the bill contains limitations and that it can be reviewed by Congress. It has a limitation of \$100 million and a limitation with respect to time. Such provisions put an end to any argument to the effect that it is a grandiose international giveaway plan. It indicates that the program will be subject to review by Congress. At no time will our surplus of stocks be threatened, and we must always keep in mind the necessity of having a normal reserve of agricultural commodities. I believe the proposed legislation has taken into consideration many of the complaints which were registered earlier to this type of legislation. It surely meets the general thought of the junior Senator from Minnesota on the subject.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I should like to make one more point, and then I shall yield the floor. The committee did consider a proposal to limit the amount which could be used in any one country to \$25 million. We thought it over and concluded it was unwise to do so, particularly for the reason that there may be some countries which at the present time are well nigh inaccessible to us but which conceivably in the future may be made accessible to shipments from the United States.

Such countries could find themselves in great need of large quantities of our

surplus farm commodities, without our having much prior notice of the fact. We do not need to exercise much imagination to realize the great need which could develop within such countries for a considerable amount of our surplus farm commodities. The committee decided that we should not put a limitation on the amount which could be used in any one country, but to leave it to the President.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I believe the Senator from Vermont will agree that that fact was well illustrated recently in the situation in East Germany, and probably it will be illustrated many times in the future.

Mr. AIKEN. If East Germany or a nation of corresponding size suddenly found itself relatively free from a certain environment, we would want to help that country. Recently the President offered to help East Germany. In view of that experience, we realize how inadequate a sum of that kind would be if a whole country were to open up. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desired to ask a question. I shall be glad to ask it of the Senator from Florida. It seems to me that the good Lord has provided us with a tremendous weapon to bring about, as it were, understanding among people who are in dire need.

It is a well known fact—and of course many women use it—that the way to a man's heart is through his stomach. Certainly the way to the heart of tired and hungry people and to their understanding is through the stomach.

My question is this: Does not the distinguished Senator from Florida feel that the superabundance, as it were, of foodstuffs has been provided to us with almost a divine purpose, namely, to bring about understanding among the peoples of the earth? The second question is, Will not food work better than cannons and guns and war materials in bringing about such understanding?

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator for his questions, and I shall try to answer them. A kindly Providence has provided us with great productive power, and has made available from our soil a great abundance of food and fiber. The proof of whether this abundance will bring about better understanding among the nations will largely lie with how we use that surplus.

I certainly believe that by the use of it in the manner provided in the bill, our Nation as a whole will show that it regards our productiveness in this field as a gift from Providence which we must use not only for ourselves, but also for other human beings in distress.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator from Wisconsin restate his second question?

Mr. WILEY. Will not the program be more effective than the utilization of arms?

Mr. HOLLAND. There should not be any comparison, even, between the ef-

fectiveness of the two. Although the use of arms is sometimes necessary, and often accomplishes results which cannot be accomplished in any other way, the fact remains that the use of arms brings destruction of life and property and brings with its also hatred and bitterness, which lives for generations. On the other hand, the extension of mercy and compassion, given largely to mothers and children, certainly builds exactly the opposite kind of sentiment from the very beginning, and in the most helpful way possible.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KILGORE. In connection with giving aid from our abundance, I wonder whether the Senator from Wisconsin has realized that we are following the policy of Pitt the Younger, in the Napoleonic wars, when he used the productive capacity of Britain, together with free trade on the necessary raw materials, to supply the enemies of Napoleon and assist them, through periods of starvation and shortage, not only with food, but also with arms and equipment, so as to further their aim of ridding themselves of that European tyrant. Has the Senator from Wisconsin ever considered that historical background of the action now proposed?

Mr. WILEY. I did not quite understand all the Senator from West Virginia said. I am sure he is better equipped to answer the question than I am. If his purpose is to indicate that by means of the utilization of food, one can develop friends among those who are in need, then I believe the answer is "Yes."

Of course, there are many instances in history when those who have been helped have forgotten those who helped them.

On the other hand, from the individual point of view, certainly it is better to give than to receive. Similarly, in the case of nations, I think it is better for them to be the givers, rather than the receivers. But if the receiver feels the true impact of the gift, and if the gift is given without thought of material return, I am sure that process will engender good will among nations.

Mr. KILGORE. During the Napoleonic wars, England had adequate productive capacity, just as we have now, but did not have adequate raw materials, including food. So England modified her laws, so that both food and materials could be admitted duty-free from countries which would aid England in opposing the tyrant Napoleon.

Thus I say that today we are in a much better position than England was at that time, because we have both the necessary foodstuffs and the necessary productive capacity with which to meet the tyrant's threat, provided we are able to obtain the benefit of the manpower and the productive capacity of other nations, as applied to the foodstuffs and the

productive capacity we are able to provide.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my remarks will be brief.

First, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report on the pending bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 631) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2249) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States, having considered same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

S. 2249 was introduced pursuant to the request of the President, set out herein as exhibit A. Its purpose is to enable him to furnish emergency assistance in the form of agricultural commodities to friendly peoples suffering from famine or other urgent relief problems. Several times during past years Congress and the President have acted, and acted promptly, in extending such assistance; and Congress is prepared promptly to consider recommendations for assistance in the future. This authority may be especially necessary when Congress is not in session. As introduced, the bill contained a termination date of June 30, 1955, but your committee felt that a termination date of March 15, 1954, would cover the period Congress will not be in session and a sufficient period after Congress meets again.

In view of the shortness of the period for which the bill would be effective and the fact that Congress will be in session for a considerable period before the bill's termination date, it was felt that \$100 million would be sufficient to take care of any emergencies which might occur, and the assistance which may be furnished under the bill would consequently be limited to that sum by committee amendment. Some consideration was given to limiting the amount available for assistance to any one country, but situations as to need, size of population, and other factors would vary so greatly that the committee felt this must be left to the discretion and wisdom of the President.

As introduced, the bill provided for assistance to friendly nations.

The committee feared that this might restrict it to peoples whose governments are friendly, whereas the real purpose of the bill is also to help those of good will who need our help and have our sympathy. The committee amendment in this regard would make it clear assistance may be furnished to friendly populations if it can be assured that the assistance will reach them.

The committee realizes that the furnishing of assistance of this sort must necessarily have some effect on the economy of the recipient country, as well as exporting countries, commercial suppliers, and others. The desire of the committee is simply to furnish aid on behalf of our Nation to those in need, and such aid should be furnished in such manner as to avoid all possible injury to the domestic economy of any friendly country or the channels of commercial trade. To the maximum extent practicable consistent with good business practices and the purposes of the act, the normal channels of trade should be utilized in carrying out the act.

In order that Congress may be fully advised on the manner in which any programs under the bill may be working the committee

intends to request a full report thereon shortly after Congress convenes in January.

EXHIBIT A

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD GIVE AUTHORITY TO USE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES HELD BY THIS GOVERNMENT TO MEET NEEDS ARISING FROM FAMINE OR OTHER URGENT RELIEF REQUIREMENTS

To the Congress of the United States:

Because of the great productivity of our farms, the people of the United States have been able, on several occasions in recent years, to come to the aid of friendly countries faced with famine. In 1951 agricultural supplies were provided to India, and only recently wheat has been made available to the people of Pakistan. In both instances we were able to provide assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements by using stocks of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. On each of these occasions the Congress has been forced to add consideration of these emergency programs to its very heavy workload. This procedure not only adds to the congressional burden but also slows the speed with which this Government can come to the assistance of a nation urgently needing relief.

I therefore believe it advisable to have general legislation which, within appropriate limitations, would permit the President to meet these situations. The legislation I am requesting would give the President the authority to utilize agricultural commodities held by this Government, but it would limit that authority to meet only the occasional needs arising from famine or other urgent relief requirements.

The objectives of such a program are not to be confused with the principal objective of our mutual security program. The mutual security program aims at promoting the long-range security of the United States by assisting our friends to strengthen their long-range economic and defensive capabilities. The program I am now proposing aims at mitigating the hard blows of unusual and urgent emergencies.

Since we cannot adequately foresee the specific needs to be met under the legislation I am requesting, we cannot now determine the most effective and equitable conditions under which such assistance may be rendered in a particular situation. Consequently, I am requesting authority to establish, when the need arises, the terms and conditions under which these agricultural commodities shall be made available.

In order that there may be a minimum of delay in assisting nations stricken with famine or having other urgent relief requirements, I am requesting that the Commodity Credit Corporation be given authority to make available from its stocks the necessary agricultural commodities to meet these emergency needs. To prevent impairment of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to permit necessary budgetary adjustments, I am recommending an authorization to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent of its investment in commodities furnished by it, plus any other costs, including interest, which it may incur in carrying out programs authorized under this act. When the costs of any programs carried out under terms of this act can be ascertained the Congress will be asked to appropriate the necessary funds to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. I further propose that the authority to undertake programs of famine and other urgent relief assistance under this legislation expire on June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1953.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that when the President's message came to the Senate, there were some of us who objected to its very broad scope. I think no Member of the Senate failed to agree with the objectives which the message showed the President had in mind, namely, to provide, from our abundance, food as a measure of compassion and mercy, to those suffering from famine or from some other great cause of distress requiring emergency relief.

In acting upon this measure, the committee has unanimously in accord with the objectives set forth in the President's message. The changes recommended by the committee are simply those which the committee felt would accord more fully with the exigencies of the occasion and also with the preservation by Congress of its full responsibility, power to act, and right to consider and act upon any subsequent development of great size which might occur.

The Senate will note that the committee report states that:

Several times during past years Congress and the President have acted, and acted promptly, in extending such assistance; and Congress is prepared promptly to consider recommendations for assistance in the future.

We had in mind such things as the making of the loan of wheat to India and the grant to Pakistan; and we felt that Congress should preserve its responsibility, as well as, of course, its freedom of action upon such matters in the future.

However, we realized that emergencies might develop quickly, and at times when Congress was not in session.

So the bill, as reported from the committee, covers the entire period of time between the adjournment of this session of Congress and the beginning of the next session, on January 3, 1954. In order to be sure that subsequent action, if any, taken at the next session will be based upon all available facts, the time limit provided in the bill as reported, is March 15, 1954, thus giving Congress 2½ months after the beginning of the next session to consider what action should be taken in extending this bill or in passing a similar bill.

The Senate will note that the last paragraph of the report reads as follows:

In order that Congress may be fully advised on the manner in which any programs under the bill may be working the committee intends to request a full report thereon shortly after Congress convenes in January.

So it is the intention of the committee that the President shall have the very full power provided by the bill, until the convening of the next session of Congress, and thereafter until March 15, 1954.

It is also the purpose of the committee to make sure that Congress shall have the latest facts in regard to any program which may originate in this field, before being called upon to take further action.

Mr. President, the limitation in amount similarly was, in the judgment of the committee, a desirable provision, not only in order to preserve the responsibility of Congress but also in order to

make it clear that this measure is by no means one providing for dumping or for salvage of agricultural products and that it has no place at all in the agricultural price support program. It happens incidentally, only, that the stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation were attained in connection with the operation of the price support program; but the \$100 million worth of agricultural commodities covered by the bill—and that amount would also cover the handling and delivery costs—would be but a small part of the entire stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and could not have any great impact upon the operation of the price support program.

It was thought that it should be made completely clear that this measure is not a part of the price-support program, and that all of us hope there will be no occasion for any action to be taken under this measure.

I am sure nothing would please the people of the United States more than to have peace and plenty prevail everywhere in the areas of the earth where this act could be called into play if there were emergency or famine. But if emergency or famine occurs, we wish to have adequate machinery available, so that the President can act promptly in order to show that he is empowered by the people of the United States to extend relief which—to use the idea advanced a few minutes ago by the Senator from Wisconsin—would certainly go much farther than any sort of weapons could go or than any other kind of aid could go in getting ready, perhaps, for some trial at arms which might lie ahead, or any other sort of assistance which could be rendered, and which certainly would demonstrate more clearly the humanitarian feelings and sentiments of the people of the United States than anything else could do.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I know his heart is in this bill, and it is a very laudable attempt, and I assume we are trying to make friends in Germany and elsewhere, as against the Soviet enemies. Is that true?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that will be one of the results of this measure, in the event it is used; and I think it will be one of the results from the very enactment of this measure. But I should like to have the world know—and I believe every Senator wishes the world to know—that we are not thinking now solely in terms of war. Today we have just brought to an end the fighting in Korea, and certainly for a while there will be an armistice there, regardless of the final outcome; and all of us are hoping for peace after a few months.

But certainly this is a timely occasion, it is a proper hour for the Senate to sound a note of mercy, a note of human understanding, a note of being willing to do something, in the name of our Nation, for humanitarian reasons, in the belief that there is still need on the earth

for the extension of activity of that kind and for the doing of things for others who cannot do for themselves. So I may say to the Senator that, while I think the very thing that he has mentioned will result from the passage of the pending measure and from its use, my own feeling is that our purpose goes a good deal deeper than that, and that it really exemplifies the feeling of the people of this Nation, who by their donation of many millions of dollars to the Red Cross on countless occasions, and, at other times, to other programs, have shown their desire to be merciful to others who are in great need. I think we should make that our big objective as we pass the pending measure.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

TAXPAYERS' MONEY TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Mr. MALONE. Naturally the junior Senator from Nevada will enter no objection to the shipment of such surplus products to foreign countries, products that have been purchased with money of the taxpayers—money through subsidies.

Mr. President, about 2 years ago, the Senate voted millions of dollars for the purpose of buying and giving to India a large amount of wheat.

RUSSIA CHARGES FOR WHEAT

As a matter of fact, very soon after that, India purchased wheat from Russia and paid for it. From newspaper reports we are able to understand that Russia is now engaged in a drive to determine what Germany can produce—and I am merely using Germany as an example—to be used in payment for the wheat and food products that Russia intends to send into Germany.

Russia is endeavoring to get a quid pro quo, an exact payment in return for everything the Russians send to Germany, or in fact to any nation.

They were able to obtain a quid pro quo from India, and Russia is now going to get it from Germany—and that is entirely possible since Germany has a productive capacity; simply take credit in Germany's currency then credit them when we buy products from them.

Again, I am merely using Germany as an example, with respect to productive capacity.

We could easily have obtained rupees in payment for all the wheat that we sent to India, and could have obtained the rupees at the current rate of exchange—not what the people of India said the rupees were worth, of course, that having been a fictitious price—but we could have obtained them as an equivalent or a quid pro quo from India.

India produces monazite sands, which we need very much in connection with our nuclear power production. India produces hemp, which we need in America, and she can produce manganese in sufficient quantity to supply both India and this country for many years.

We could have purchased manganese, monazite sands, or any one of 15 or 20 materials that are produced in India, and we could then have been given cred-

it to India in rupees at the then current rate of exchange for goods shipped to us.

It would have represented a quid pro quo, similar to what takes place when a man goes to a bank to borrow money; he gives his note, the credit in rupees would correspond to the note at the bank.

The point is, of course, that India would have had to produce something with which to pay for what she obtained from this country.

I suggested at the time that we were sending the wheat, that the bill then before the Senate be amended to provide for our simply accepting credit in rupees in payment, at the then current rate of exchange. We would then have been acting as banker for India. We could do the same thing now.

RUSSIA IS A SMARTER TRADER

But I point out that Russia does not follow that course. Russia does not have a \$275 billion debt as we do. But Russia does not purchase butter and wheat from us, or from a number of other countries, to store our supplies in caves and warehouses throughout the country, later to find some way of giving it away.

Only the United States of America will do that.

Mr. President, I want to point out that I am not going to object to the pending bill.

But it seems to me that the Congress of the United States might, at some time and at some place, start considering the taxpayers of America and transact business as other nations do, on a quid pro quo basis. We might send wheat to any place where it might be needed, taking credit in that nation's money and then crediting them with those materials we buy from them. Incidentally, we might give the Germans an opportunity to work; all they need is a chance to work. The German people, if allowed to proceed in their own way for a few years, could outproduce any other nation of Europe.

As the Senator from Florida well knows, we ourselves devised the Morgenthau plan, which held the Germans back for 6 or 7 years, during which they had no opportunity to do anything. We now find the German people to be hungry but willing to work; and I say let them work for what they need, just the same as our taxpayers expect to do.

DIVISION OF WEALTH

We would not in that case be dividing the wealth of the people of this Nation with the nations of the world.

In this country we have reached the point where the tax burden is almost what may be termed the last straw that breaks the camel's back.

We have extended the excess-profits tax. The Senate refused to approve a bill introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada which would have provided an 11-percent reduction in individual income taxes, as of June 30, repeal the wartime tax; nor did we allow the excess-profits tax to expire, as, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, we should have done. We have an excise tax on transportation, we have an entertain-

ment tax, and we have a communications tax, all from 15 to 20 percent.

The people of this country, particularly those in Nevada whom I represent, but, I am sure, in the majority of the 48 States, have reached the breaking point in the payment of taxes and inflated prices.

TAXPAYERS YOU DO NOT SEE

You do not see these people in Washington, by the way—I may say to the distinguished Senator from Florida, they do not have money with which to come to Washington.

They often have to borrow money to pay the excessive taxes. Of course, under present conditions, if they are ranchers, the more steers they feed the more money they will lose, because of the farming that is done on the Senate floor, which has upset the entire equilibrium of the meat-grain industries.

Every time a problem is discovered in some foreign country we appropriate more money. We have no consideration for the taxpayers of this country, about whom I speak. With those people, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Florida, \$5, \$10, or \$50 has a great deal to do with the kind of clothes the children will wear when school opens in September.

I am just asking the distinguished Senator whether he does not believe that the day is near when the Senate must consider the people of this Nation.

Sometime, somewhere, we must ask for a quid pro quo, and quit scattering American taxpayers' money around the world.

My suggestion, made almost continuously for the last 5 years—give us credit in their own currency for what we give them—then we credit them for what we buy from them—always at the current rate of exchange on the stock exchanges of the world at the time of the transaction, not at a fictitious value that may be fixed by that nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I prefer, first, to reply to the Senator from Nevada. If he will look upon his desk, he will find Senate bill 2475, also coming from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which, I am happy to say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada, creates a piece of machinery for the very purpose for which he has been discussing, namely, to increase the exportation of our surplus agricultural commodities and the sale of some of them to nations in exchange for their own currencies, with other details, as will be apparent to the Senator if he will read the bill. However, I am sure the Senator is correct in his statement that his people are a merciful people and a generous people; and I am sure that, just as he has said he has no objection to the pending measure, so his people would feel the same way, that there is a place, and a very distinct place, for mercy, and particularly in the troublous picture which now prevails in so many parts of the earth. So if the Senator will remain in the Senate chamber for an hour or more, he will have an opportunity to pass upon

the measure exactly in line with his thinking.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. MALONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield first to the acting majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida whether it is not true that, on page 3, beginning at the end of line 6, and running through line 9, it is stated:

The President may make such transfers, through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate.

Would that permit the President, if the situation were deemed wise and desirable, to exchange this food for some other commodity; or, in a case such as that of Eastern Germany, where, obviously, the Russians would not permit the export of a commodity out of Eastern Germany, he can there make it available in the way in which it is now being distributed? In reading that language, I would assume that if there were a nation which would have no problem of paying in its own currency, but would have a problem of paying in dollars, he could, under that language, make an arrangement which would permit such a nation to pay in its own currency. If it were a situation in which the country was flat on its back and had a famine and could not even pay with its own currency, he could make it available as pure famine relief, with no payment whatever.

If, on the other hand, there were certain things they might be able to do, the President, under that section, would be permitted to work out an exchange of service or perhaps of help in building certain installations. It seems to me the language is sufficiently broad to cover the point raised by the Senator from Nevada. But I say, quite frankly, I would hope that whatever could be done would be done more and more on a quid pro quo basis. We must recognize, however, that in some countries there is a dollar shortage and at the present time they are not in position to pay in dollars.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in reply to the distinguished majority leader, I desire to remind him that not only is it true that the people of East Germany are not in position to pay anything, but they cannot send anything across the border, and can come across the border themselves only under pain of penalties, but it is also the case in the Pakistan matter, which the Senate approved a few months ago, that the financial situation there and the nonproduction which had resulted from no fault of their own, but from a continuation of drought—I believe this is the third year of it—were so serious that it would have made them more helpless economically if they had been required to pay. Therefore, Congress decided, in its judgment, and I think the decision was wise and proper, that the wheat we sent them should be a gift, because their paying for it would have simply lessened their ability to

carry on and remain free and independent, which we want them to be and which they want to be.

So these cases will have to stand upon their own bottoms. My feeling is that if the famine or emergency conditions are such as to permit of the suffering peoples doing something for themselves, the President will require that.

Suppose it were a seafaring nation that could supply emergency transportation, though it did not have the food and could not pay for the food. There would be an occasion where the part of the gift which would be created otherwise by the payment of transportation costs might come from the country itself. Senators may think of any number of similar situations which may result from different sets of facts in different places.

This bill will enable the President of the United States to meet famine and starvation, to meet dire distress emergency, if it prevails in a particular case, to meet it by a grant which will come from the generous and merciful heart of the United States.

I think it is only incidental, though I thought it was proper to mention it, because the distinguished Senator from Nevada made clear his position, which is certainly understandable, to invite attention to another bill which will come up in the next few days, I think, to build new machinery for international trade along the exact lines which the Senator has mentioned. I certainly support, likewise, the statement of the distinguished Senator from California that there may be cases coming up under this bill where something can be paid by the recipient, and, if so, of course, we would expect the President so to require.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have been approached in connection with this bill by representatives of the fishing industry who inquired whether fisheries could be included in line 23, on page 2.

Is there any reason why fisheries cannot be included in this bill together with agricultural commodities?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator that the fisheries question had not been brought up in the committee. I do not believe our committee has jurisdiction of that subject matter. In the bill as drafted I doubt very much whether fisheries could be included. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is present. Perhaps he has a different view. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee so that if he has a different viewpoint on this subject he may so state to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, under the bill as drafted, commodities made available to the President for relief of famine and other emergencies are restricted to those acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation. So far as I know, there is no provision of law which permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the price of fish, and, therefore, it would be unlikely to acquire any fish.

I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on that point, but I think I am correct in saying that the Commodity Credit Corporation could not have any fish, and, therefore, it could not give the President any fish for distribution.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator is correct. However, I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact—and I think it is appropriate that this statement be made—that this bill in no sense seeks to occupy the whole field. The Senator, of course, is familiar with the provision of the Mutual Security Act which has to do with food and food production. The Senator is familiar with the fact that the Army is administering relief in Korea even now to the civilian population, and it certainly is not precluded from buying any food products which are available and desirable for that purpose.

The Senator is familiar with the fact that there are emergency funds in the hands of the President which might be so used.

The purpose of the bill is to act in accordance with the suggestions of the Chief Executive by establishing machinery under which to act speedily and mercifully on behalf of our Nation in dipping into the supplies of food and fiber which the Commodity Credit Corporation may have in stock and sending those supplies, to a total of \$100 million in value, including the handling and transportation costs, to those who are stricken by famine or other emergency, who are friendly to us, or who come within the second category of this bill to which I intended to address myself, if the Senator will permit, at this time, because I think the mention of it will make it clear that the people in East Germany are also within the picture.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I understand correctly that it would take a change in the fundamental price-support law for fish to be included among the commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. Not only does the Commodity Credit Corporation have no fish, not only is its field of activity confined to agriculture, but if it were sought to extend the bill to include fish, we would have the anomalous situation of the Commodity Credit Corporation handling something it knows nothing about and paying the expense of handling something which it has no authority, generally speaking, to handle, and it would be mixing two fields that are as unmixable as are oil and water.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that under the law, if there should be a tremendous surplus of cranberries, the Commodity Credit Corporation could acquire cranberries and give them to the President for use in countries where

cranberries would help relieve famine or other emergency.

So I hope the distinguished Senator does not feel that Massachusetts will be left out completely.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am certain I do no violence to the Senator from Massachusetts when I state that I am completely sure that out of his great humanitarian heart comes complete sympathy for the bill and all it proposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. I hope there will be no surplus of cranberries.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Nevada will permit me to make two brief points then I shall be glad to yield.

First, in addition to what I have already said, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] appeared before the committee with a strong suggestion that our bill be drawn so as to make it clear that assistance could be furnished to friendly populations, even if the governments where such friendly populations existed would not act with us, with the President, or with our governmental agencies. In accordance with that suggestion, the committee enlarged the bill to cover that field.

At present, that provision of the bill could clearly apply to East Germany. Of course, we shall all hope that it would not always apply to East Germany, because, eventually, we hope to have friendly relations with whatever government shall become the permanent government of East Germany. At least, the appeal of the suffering human beings who need help, and to whom help can be given, as individuals—and that requirement is included—should not be predicated upon the fact that their governing agencies are friendly or unfriendly to the United States.

The last point is that the committee realized that the program might be handled in such a way as to harm seriously the regular commercial agencies, the regular commercial machinery, for the supplying of food and fiber to nations in which famine or very great distress prevailed. So the committee made it clear by its report that it felt that, under no circumstances, should that objective be lost sight of. I read that part of the report which bears upon this point:

The committee realizes that the furnishing of assistance of this sort must necessarily have some effect on the economy of the recipient country, as well as exporting countries, commercial suppliers, and others. The desire of the committee is simply to furnish aid on behalf of our Nation to those in need, and such aid should be furnished in such manner as to avoid all possible injury to the domestic economy of any friendly country or the channels of commercial trade. To the maximum extent practicable consistent with good business practices and the purposes of the act, the normal channels of trade should be utilized in carrying out the act.

Before terminating my remarks, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in making that condition, in stating that understanding, our committee really were only doing in this bill exactly

what we have done by law in our own Nation in connection with the requirement that the gifts of surplus agricultural commodities to penal institutions, hospitals, and the like, and the gifts of the bounty of our Nation to school-children who may need food which the Government can furnish them, are in each instance subject to the condition that commercial channels of trade themselves shall not be ignored and, of course, shall not be interfered with or injured.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

THE PROBLEM—DISPOSING OF THE BODY

Mr. MALONE. I simply wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I am certain his whole heart is in the bill, and I am certain he believes in it, but this is a fairly easy way of disposing of the body.

It is easy to use the taxpayers' money, as long as it lasts, to buy surplus products to store in caves and bins.

\$3 PER HUNDRED CORN VERSUS \$20 PER HUNDRED CATTLE

But finally it piles up, just as corn, wheat, and other commodities have piled up, to the extent that we are now contemplating building bins for the third corn and wheat crop.

Of course, I am not now objecting to this bill to dispose of the surplus, as the Senator will understand.

But I see hungry cattle in the West. Three dollar corn cannot be fed to \$20 cattle, except at a loss of 50 cents a day per cow or per steer, even if they gained 2 pounds a day. Then it would not matter how much money the cattlemen had; they could not afford to feed them at such a loss. They would simply leave the feed in the bins.

STORED BINS OF CORN AND WHEAT VERSUS HUNGRY CATTLE

So we have bins of corn and wheat strung out all the way from central Kansas to the Atlantic coast, and hungry cattle scattered all the way from western Kansas to the Pacific coast.

No one in his right mind would put \$2 into the sheep business now. Free trade on wool disposed of that business. The production of wool has been reduced by more than two-thirds, and our imports have gone up by that amount. While we are buying and storing our own wool through a subsidy, we are buying and using wool produced by cheaper labor and feed from Australia. It is easy enough to do that—and break your own people as long as the taxpayers' money lasts.

All this business is like shooting a man. It is easy enough to shoot him, but it is disposing of the body that is embarrassing, and gets everyone in trouble.

I have no objection to disposing of the surplus, even of cranberries, if it comes to that, but why do we not learn by experience so we can give the "forgotten man"—the taxpayer of this Nation—some relief.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from Nevada has said. I would be remiss in my obligation to the committee as a whole if I did not remind the distinguished Sen-

ator that our committee has insisted upon trying to deal practically and realistically with every problem about which he has been speaking.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Out of our committee came the demand that the wheat acreage for next year should be reduced from 78,500,000 acres, the amount planted this year, to 61 million acres. The Senator will recall that in conference it was necessary to yield one additional million to the other House. But even the 62 million acres which are specified as the whole quota, the whole allotment, to be distributed among wheat growers next year is a tremendous reduction from the 78,500,000 acres planted this year.

I think the Senator will also recall that the demand for the termination of the support price of Irish potatoes came from me and from other Senators, who were then members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, some of whom are still members.

The Senator will recall that during the wheat acreage debate it was freely stated on the floor of the Senate only the other day that the same sort of program would have to be instituted for corn, because corn had been overproduced and was present in superabundance.

I simply wish the Senator to realize, and the RECORD to show, that members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are completely cognizant of the truth of the statements relative to agricultural surpluses made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, and that we are trying to deal with these problems realistically, and shall continue to do so. We realize, just as does the Senator, that under the high price support program and unlimited acreage, and with the good seasons with which the United States has been blessed in recent years, there is at this time a tremendous surplus.

I close on this point by reminding the Senator from Nevada of what I said a few moments ago. The entire hundred-million-dollar program authorized in the bill, and I would include not only the value of the stocks used, but also the transportation and handling, would not be a drop in the bucket to deal with the large problem which the Senator from Nevada has mentioned.

This is no part of that problem. We shall all hope there will not be a famine or great disaster anywhere, so that the program will not have to be used. But if a need does arise for its use, we want the Nation, beginning now, to permit the President of the United States to act for all of us, for all the States, and all the people of the Nation in doing that which is humanitarian, which is merciful, and which we think, aside from doing good to those who give, will also result in doing greater good, by building better feeling and a better understanding of our motives throughout the world than perhaps anything else we could do.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

DUTY TO EQUALIZE THE PRICE

Mr. MALONE. I call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact that in the case of importing potatoes, on which we had to pay the support price, and then painted them green and fed them to hogs, or poured kerosene on them and burned them, the importation of certain types of wheat could just as well pay an equalization fee representing the difference in the cost of production here and the cost in Canada and other places where it is produced—we call it the tariff or duty.

It is the same with cattle, wool, and butter. One reason why these commodities cost so much is that we import them without any comparable tariff or duty—we buy them at the support price and store them in the caves. We had them full of dried eggs at one time, purchased largely from China. We had to finally move them out to foreign countries by the shipload in order to get them out of sight of the taxpayers who paid for them.

We could take care of our own surplus at a far less price if we had such a tariff or import fee. However, we have no adjustable duty or tariff to make up the difference between the wage standards of living here and abroad, so we are busily engaged in stabilizing the products of the surrounding countries through the support price.

FAIR TRADE—NOT FREE TRADE

If we had a tariff on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, adjustable by a Tariff Commission according to a principle of fair trade and not free trade, we would not be buying the products of cheap labor from other countries and utilizing them in place of our own, or storing them, and aggravating our surplus.

Unless we adopt such a system of flexible tariffs or duties the support program will cost the taxpayers so much money that they will rebel. As a matter of fact, they have already rebelled, they have not yet reached their Senators and Congressmen.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator has a great interest in the tariff question, which I think has no place here.

Mr. MALONE. Except when we are buying foreign products at a cheap price and storing our own.

Mr. HOLLAND. Reference has been made to the price support program, which I think has no place here. But I do want the RECORD to show what the Senator from Nevada already knows, that the three great agricultural crops in the State represented by the Senator from Florida have no support prices. We are not asking for any support prices, and there is no plan to grant any support.

First is the crop of citrus fruits. We produce more citrus fruits than all the rest of the Nation put together.

The second is winter vegetables. We produce more winter vegetables of many varieties than all the rest of the Nation put together.

The third crop is livestock. We are becoming one of the great producers of

meat. So the Senator from Florida has no direct, selfish interest, from the standpoint of making the price support program an extravagant one. The Senator from Florida has supported and continues to support the price support program for the basic storable articles of food and raiment which are necessities throughout all the world. The Senator from Florida believes that the very thing shown to be true in this instance today is true in many other fields. Our tremendous productive capacity is our "ace in the hole" in any kind of controversy or any course of dealing into which we enter with other nations. They simply cannot find anywhere else the tremendous, self-sustaining productive capacity with respect to food and raiment which is found here, and which does more than any other single thing to make us the world power that we are.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

LIMITING ACREAGE WILL NOT LIMIT CROPS

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada was raised on a farm and has some knowledge of the way in which farms are operated. He recently visited the area around Ottawa, Ill., in the midst of the Corn Belt.

It is pointed out by every farmer in that area that it makes little difference in the production how much we limit acreage, whether we limit it to 80 million acres, or some other figure.

All that is necessary is to spend a little more money for fertilizer, lime, and various minerals to balance the soil ingredients, and production is doubled. The limitation of acreage is simply a Senate and Department of Agriculture idle dream, and has no practical effect, because if a farmer wishes to produce more wheat or corn, he can do it by more intensive cultivation.

In Illinois, in the area visited, farmers produce from 100 to 140 bushels per acre. Since we started this program the production has been increased probably 50 percent. We can limit the acreage, but all it is necessary is for the farmer to do a little more intensive work and fertilization on each acre in order to practically double production. So the matter of limiting acreage by Congress has no effect whatever. The Senate will discover that next year, of course. There will be a greater overproduction than ever, which will no doubt come as a great surprise to the most deliberative body in the world.

OUR TAXPAYERS STABILIZING FOREIGN COUNTRIES

I do not mean to imply that I am objecting to these programs. What I am objecting to is buying the surplus of all the surrounding countries at the same price as our own with American taxpayers' money.

NO MONEY FOR WASHINGTON

The ordinary taxpayer does not have the money to employ a representative in Washington.

The people I am talking about do not have the money to employ lobbyists to come to Washington, or to come to

Washington themselves. The typical rancher of whom I speak is trying to dig up the money to pay his taxes and to keep the children in school.

DISTRIBUTING AND DESTROYING WEALTH

The Senate and the House are spending the money of the taxpayers faster than they can make it. We do not ask for a quid pro quo from other nations. We do not ask for the thing which they are willing to give and can give.

That is my point. This operation is like that conducted by former Secretary of Agriculture Wallace in 1934 and 1935, killing little pigs. We are doing the same thing. He drowned the little pigs and we give the crops away. He tried limiting the number of pigs by drowning. We try to regulate the production of corn and wheat by limiting acreage and by giving the surplus to foreign nations. The people on the farms and ranches understand the production of livestock and crops better than the Senators do.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had completed my remarks. I am very sure that the people on the farms of the Nation are thoroughly in accord with the purposes of the bill. I am just as sure of that as I would be if I had had the opportunity to go out and talk with them.

I know that typical Americans all over the Nation want us to use some sense of mercy and show some humanitarian interest in people who are trying to make themselves free and keep themselves free. But when they sustain disaster such as famine and starvation or some other great cataclysmic disaster which tends to destroy their ability to sustain themselves, I believe that our people as a whole expect us, out of our abundance, to do something to help them to meet that kind of dire need.

I hope the bill will be unanimously passed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to support the bill, which I think would do a great deal to cement our relations with some of the free countries of the world which now need our assistance and whose assistance we need. I think I can speak with considerable experience on this subject, for I speak as the former Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the greatest international humanitarian and relief organization in the entire history of the world. I know from personal observation the great help represented by providing food and raw materials to the suffering people of the world. This help brought about an understanding of our humanitarian traditions and appreciation. We certainly greatly need today the friendship and confidence of other nations in our fight against the Communist menace, a fight in which we have to enlist the minds and the hearts of other people. It is as important to do that as to assure our own defense by building up our armaments.

During the Second World War I visited many countries in Europe and Africa. I flew the Atlantic eight times. I saw the plight of many countries. I saw what they needed. I saw their hopelessness,

and I saw their need to be helped by people whom they considered their friends, and who were in a position to help them.

I was in Greece in 1945, just a few months after the Germans were expelled. I saw Greece teetering, undecided whether it should be on the side of the democracies or on the side of communism. It was helped by UNRRA by food and supplies which we brought to those suffering people. In my opinion that help turned the scales in favor of the democracies, encouraged people to fight against communism, and made them friends of the free nations.

I was in Italy in 1945. Italy had been fought over by many armies. I saw the suffering and the helplessness and the despair and the hunger and the cold and the lack of clothing. Italy at that time, too, was teetering, as was Greece, on the brink of going over to communism. It was the help of this country and other countries, but mainly this country, through UNRRA that turned the scales in favor of the democracies and in favor of the free countries of the world. In spite of the fact Poland and Czechoslovakia and Hungary and Rumania, the Baltic nations are now behind the Iron Curtain, I am convinced that we in the United States still have millions of friends in those countries.

I strongly believe that the great reason we have been able to maintain and hold their friendship during these bitter 8 years is that they remember and appreciate the help that came from the free countries at a time when they were starving, suffering, helpless, and hopeless.

Mr. President, I do not believe anything we could do would be of greater value in cementing our relations with those countries than by giving the President the right to use the surplus supplies. It will not cost us a large amount of money, but it will mean for us the friendship and confidence and respect of some of those countries.

During the war I saw India, poor as it was and suffering famine in many areas, nonetheless provide \$30 million for the relief of other countries which they thought were in greater need than they. That is an example we would do well to follow. It was an example and a demonstration of friendship and of high purpose which I shall never forget.

I urge that this bill will be passed, and I hope that when the necessity arises, when people appeal for help in the form of food, to this great humanitarian nation it will be granted willingly and cheerfully and in the measure of our abundance.

OUR GIVE-AWAY CONGRESS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada is not going to oppose this bill. However, it is well to point out that he does oppose the course Congress has been following for a good many years, in giving the taxpayers' money away throughout the world without a quid pro quo of any kind.

We have tried to bribe and buy the good will of foreign nations since World War II. There is apparently no use call-

ing attention again to the fact that the policy has cost the United States about \$45 billion since World War II.

There is probably little use to call attention to the fact that we are \$271 billion in debt and that a bill will be presented, if not at this first session of Congress, certainly early in the second session, to raise the debt limit to \$290 billion.

THE BREAKING POINT IN TAXES

Apparently there is no use pointing out that the people of this Nation have about reached the ultimate breaking point in taxes.

They thought they were going to get a change. They thought they would in some manner have the Government take cognizance of their condition, and that the Government would allow some of the taxes to expire, and would lower other taxes.

The junior Senator from Nevada introduced a bill to set ahead to June 30, 1953, the expiration date of the 11 percent individual income-tax provision, which was a wartime tax, and to write off the entertainment tax and the transportation tax and the communications tax and the moving-picture-admissions tax—all of them amounting to 15 to 25 percent. We did pass a special bill to abolish the moving-picture tax. That was fine as far as it went. All wartime excise taxes should be abolished.

TWENTY BILLION DOLLARS ABROAD

We are spending not \$6 billion abroad in Europe this fiscal year, as we directly authorized here, but we are spending about \$20 billion in offshore contracts, repair contracts, and for direct gifts and in other ways.

The point has been made today with reference to the dollar shortage and that the foreign countries do not have the necessary dollars.

Mr. President, we know what that means. A dollar shortage can be caused by spending more than a person or nation earns. Such a condition can also be caused by foreign nations putting a price on their currency in dollars higher than the market price, which is actually a fictitious price; more than the money is worth on the New York and London Stock Exchanges. No agency anywhere will pay that fictitious price, except the Congress of the United States. We help them in maintaining that fictitious value of their currency.

Without going into too much detail and mentioning specific nations, they have had anywhere from 2 to 28 values for their money, in order to dodge and control the actual price of their materials in the foreign markets, and they manipulate their money for trade advantage, which in itself is a form of piracy. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MALONE. It is a form of piracy. That is what it is, Mr. President. They never intend and never have kept their trade agreements with this country. No foreign nation has kept a trade agreement with us. Here we are piling up imported materials through one of the

methods of destroying our Nation economically, and that is by way of free trade. We have done it for 20 years, and just recently we extended the practice for another year.

THE ECONOMIC APPROACH TO DESTROY THIS NATION

That is the economic approach to the destruction of our Nation, together with subsidies that are aggravated and largely made necessary on several crops by virtue of such imports. It would be less necessary if we had a tariff or duty on the basis of fair and reasonable competition—fair trade—not free trade. I point out that with respect to the agricultural situation, at least 80 to 85 percent of agricultural products would not need a subsidy if we had a tariff fixed on the basis of such fair and reasonable competition.

We would then bring such products in on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. That would not prevent imports. They would naturally come in when needed, but they would not come for storage in caves.

I close by saying that the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] has introduced a bill which takes cognizance of that fact, and would take a foreign nation's currency in full payment for the goods on the basis of the actual value of their money, not on the basis of what they say their money is worth. The exchange value would be on the basis of what their money is worth on the stock exchanges.

We do not put a price on the dollar.

CANADIANS ARE SMART

It is worth what it is worth. When it was worth less than the Canadian dollar we did not say it was worth \$1.10, instead of 97 cents. We let it go for actual value. I was in Canada in 1948 when they were waiting for us to pass the Marshall plan, so England would have the cash with which to pay cash for Canadian wheat. They are just that smart. That is the reason their dollar became worth more than ours.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some hourly wage statistics giving a comparison between what is paid in the United States and what is paid in Canada.

There being no objection the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Industry	Canada	United States
All manufacturing.....	\$1.28	\$1.75
Coal mining.....	1.43	2.46-2.49
Machinery manufacturing.....	1.35	1.95
Iron foundry.....	1.40	1.84

¹ Depending on what type of coal mined.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, they had a subsidy of \$7.50 per ounce on gold. Why? Because they could not mine it for \$35. They could mine it if they received a \$7.50 subsidy. Their government gave them \$7.50, and our Government gave them \$35. Did we help our own gold producers? No, we did not do that. So I point out that in every case when we leave it to the Executive we simply wind up on the giving end.

Our taxpayers cannot afford it, Mr. President.

THE WHERRY-MALONE-KEM RESOLUTION

I wish to point out that in 1949 or 1950, I believe—at least, it was subsequent to enactment of the Marshall plan, and was at about the time of the commencement of the ECA program—the Senate adopted the so-called Wherry-Malone-Kem resolution, to keep the money from going to any nation which was trading with the potential enemy. But, Mr. President, immediately the State Department, by means of its great propaganda machine, had the so-called Battle bill introduced, so as to make the Wherry-Malone-Kem resolution ineffective. The Battle bill, when enacted, permitted the State Department to decide upon the trade which the 17 Marshall plan countries could conduct with the Iron Curtain countries and Russia. The Executive allowed the trade to continue, and it is still flourishing. So, in effect, we were subsidizing our competition, and also were subsidizing the production of materials of war to be used against us in Korea and elsewhere.

Mr. President, I am not complaining about the pending measure except to say that it is time the Members of the Senate understand where this money is coming from and it is time that someone pointed out that we are not the "great, rich Uncle Sam" that some persons seem to think we are, and also that when there is an economic depression in the United States, that Uncle Sam has no "uncle."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, like the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and my very able colleague from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I am thoroughly in favor of legislation of the type now proposed. I think such legislation will go a long way toward preventing the spread of communism, and I believe it is the intelligent way for us to use our resources in the great struggle now going on in the world. I believe that food and sustenance properly given in a spirit of helpfulness will do more to persuade than will bullets or bombs.

However, Mr. President, at this time I shall submit and send to the desk an amendment which I am frank to say does not have a great deal to do with the basic provisions and purposes of the pending bill. However, the amendment will not in any wise minimize or detract from the purposes or policies of the pending bill.

So, Mr. President, at this time I offer, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] the amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to insert:

SEC. 4. Until the date provided in section 3 of this act, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall not promulgate or enforce any rule, regulation, order, or other requirement

under the provisions of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act, for the purpose of regulating the duration of any lease, contract, or other arrangement for the use of any motor vehicle or the amount of compensation to be paid for such use.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as I have stated, the amendment has nothing whatsoever to do with the basic provisions or purposes of the pending bill.

However, we have canvassed the situation, to see whether or not we could submit the amendment to some other measure. But after reviewing the calendar which has been outlined and set up by the acting majority leader, we have decided that this present measure is the logical measure to which to offer the amendment. This amendment seeks to stop the Interstate Commerce Commission from prohibiting the farmers the right to trip lease their trucks.

The amendment does not require that the Senate vote at this time on the merits of trip leasing; it does not say that trip leasing is good or bad. We do not wish to have the Senate decide at this time on the merits or demerits of trip leasing. I am sure that all Senators realize the practice, which has grown up since 1935, whereby a farmer will take his produce to market, unload it there, and then lease his truck to a certificated carrier, who will load it with manufactured goods and return it to the point of origin.

In this case we are trying to have the Senate and the House of Representatives postpone the taking of action by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which at this time has issued an order to the effect that on September 1, trip leasing will no longer be permitted.

The committee has not had an opportunity to consider the practice of trip leasing. About 3 weeks ago this matter went to the subcommittee, the chairman of which is the able junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD]. The other members of the subcommittee are the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. The subcommittee has been holding hearings on the practice of trip leasing. So far as I can learn, the subcommittee has not yet had its hearings printed, and has not even thought about making a recommendation. Obviously, the full committee has not had an opportunity to consider the practice of trip leasing; and obviously, of course, the Senators on the floor have not had an opportunity to do so.

If this amendment is not adopted, the Interstate Commerce Commission, through administrative order, will, in effect, defeat the entire purpose of Congress in connection with that matter, the transportation of agricultural products. In 1935, by means of section 203 (b) (6) Congress ruled that trucks used by farmers to carry their produce from their farms to market should not come within the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission, so far as the duration of leases, on return trips are concerned.

If the Interstate Commerce Commission is able to take such action on September 1, as is now scheduled, that will

mean, in effect, defeating the will of Congress.

By adopting this amendment, the Senate will have voted to postpone the effective date of the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission until March 15, 1954. That is recommended because it is believed by the sponsors of the amendment that that will give the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce sufficient time to consider the merits of trip leasing and to make a recommendation to the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I think it entirely proper at this time to point out the various steps this matter has taken.

In the first place, as I understand, the Interstate Commerce Commission issued an order against trip-leasing. The Commission was created by Congress to regulate interstate commerce. In its wisdom, after long study and hearings and great consideration, the Commission decided that trip leasing was not in the public interest.

After the Commission made that decision and issued the order, the matter was taken to the Supreme Court. The proponents of trip leasing fought the case in the Supreme Court, which rendered a decision upholding the action taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. President, at this time let me outline the procedure in the case of trip leasing: Some organizations and companies which have obtained certificates of convenience and necessity to serve certain areas and to transport agricultural commodities over certain highways, do not have any equipment. So they trip-lease the equipment of a person who perhaps has made a down payment on a truck. He is hired to transport the commodities. In many instances, probably, he is hired at very much less than the customary wage paid to truckers, and is directed to haul the commodities over the highways. In many instances the poor fellow, in trying to make payments on his truck, drives night and day through many States, and does not obtain sufficient rest. Of course, it was unfair competition to the trucking companies who paid their help well and who provided sufficient help so that the trucks they operate were not menaces on the highways. For that reason, as well as for many other reasons, the ICC, after long and careful study, decided that the practice was an exceedingly bad one, and so it issued the order.

As all of us know, neither farmers nor agricultural products are subject to regulation by the ICC; that is, if one who is operating a truckline picks up a load of agricultural products which have not been processed, it is unnecessary for him to have a certificate giving him permission to haul them to any place in the United States. A farmer, hauling agricultural products, may haul them to a distant market, and, under the regulations, he can pick up a return load. It may not represent a financial return to him at all, but he can pick up a load and get a return haul. That, however, is not what the pending pro-

positional deals with. It is aimed at an entirely different situation. The proposal deals with a person who may have purchased a little truck, and who designs to get into the trucking business without a certificate, many times without sufficient capital even to pay his way, to buy his meals, and to purchase gasoline.

Such individuals are little fellows, and, of course, we naturally have a great sympathy for men in a situation of that kind, and would like to help them. But in this country transportation is one of the things we have regulated. We regulate it through the issuance of certificates. We have established the ICC for doing that very thing, among other duties.

The ICC, the body created by the Congress to handle such matters, is very much opposed to the pending amendment. As I have said, we have not had an opportunity in the Senate committee to make a complete study of the entire program. The bill came from the House not long ago, and it was referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The then chairman of the committee, our late and deeply lamented Senator TOBEY, appointed a subcommittee. He appointed on that subcommittee the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] as chairman, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and myself. Hearings were held by the subcommittee for 2 days, in the course of which everyone concerned with the problem was invited to testify. It was impossible for me to be present at the hearings, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] was able to be present on only 1 day. However, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] conducted the hearings and gave everyone who wanted to be heard an opportunity to appear. The transcripts of the hearings have not been printed. They were sent to the printer, but they have not yet been returned.

Neither the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] nor myself have had opportunity to study the testimony which was given at those hearings. However, we know that the ICC representative, Commissioner Knudson, appeared before the subcommittee and made a statement with respect to the pending bill.

I think that if the Senate is going to consider this matter, it would be well to read what the Commissioner had to say when he appeared before the House committee which conducted hearings and reported the bill. If it is thought that we might attach a rider of this kind to the pending measure, I may say it is a rider which has nothing whatever to do with the pending measure, which deals with a very important matter, upon which we ought to act very promptly and enact into law. It will be known for years and years as one of the finest actions ever taken by any government. In my opinion, it would be more effective than anything else we could possibly do in this country to combat communism. So the pending measure ought to be enacted very promptly, and I think the Senator would be glad to have it passed at once.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. While I do not have the information possessed by the distinguished Senator from Colorado respecting the relative merits of the bill which is under consideration before the committee of which he is a member and pertaining to the subject matter of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Florida, I wish to join with the Senator from Colorado in urging that the amendment to the pending bill be not adopted. I sincerely hope that the distinguished junior Senator from Florida will finally determine to withdraw the amendment.

The Senate has before it a bill which has been recommended by the President of the United States designed to meet the menace of international communism and to give us an effective weapon with which to combat communism overseas. It is a bill which has been studied very carefully by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and which, if I am not mistaken, was unanimously reported by that committee to the Senate. It is a bill which I believe it is essential for us to pass at this session of the Congress, if the President and the executive branch of the Government are to be provided additional means to meet the challenge of communism by contributing to the relief of famine and the needs of suffering people.

So far as I can see, the result of the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida, regardless of how meritorious, or otherwise, the subject matter may be, might be to tie the bill up in conference and destroy the chance of securing its enactment at this session of the Congress, or we might have to prolong the session of the Congress into next week in order to get the tangle finally unsnarled.

I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from Florida, for whom I have the highest regard and respect, will not press his amendment to the particular measure now pending, but will permit us to go ahead and pass the bill, which I believe will accomplish the purpose for which it is designed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say I very much share the feeling of the Senator from California. As a matter of fact, when I opened my remarks, I stated that I thoroughly approved the basic legislative proposal now pending, and that the amendment would in nowise minimize or change its terms or defeat its purposes.

Of course, the trip-leasing bill has already been passed by the House of Representatives, and the House, by an overwhelming vote, decided that the Inter-

state Commerce Commission should not have the right to prohibit farmers and others carrying agricultural commodities from indulging in the practice of trip-leasing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator from Florida to make a misstatement. The farmer is not prohibited by the ICC order from trip-leasing. He has full opportunity to do all the trip-leasing he may care to and he can haul his own agricultural products, without any restraint.

Mr. SMATHERS. I beg to disagree with my distinguished friend in that interpretation. I am confident the testimony will show that practically every farm organization is opposed to the order issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission. A reading of the list of them will reveal that everyone of them is opposed. Why? Because the Interstate Commerce Commission proposes to prohibit the practice of trip-leasing on the part of farmers, those who own trucks—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I cannot yield to let my friend make misstatements. I know he has simply been misinformed. Farmers and farmer cooperatives can do all the trip-leasing they want to do. They can haul their products over any kind of a highway and they do not need any certificate of any kind. The Senator from Florida must be talking about another group; he is not talking about farmers.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator say that if the Interstate Commerce Commission order becomes operative, the farmer will be able to take his truck to Chicago loaded with fresh fruits and vegetables from Florida, and, after he has unloaded, take the truck to a certificated carrier and lease it for the return trip?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Can any cooperative association which has trucks, take its trucks and unload them and then lease them for one trip back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. I beg to disagree with the able Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this goes to show that the proponents are presenting something they simply do not understand.

Mr. SMATHERS. Order M-43 prohibits leasing for less than 30 days, does it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Not as to farmers.

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes; that is what the argument is about. That is why farmers are protesting. Why would farm organizations be protesting if that is not the fact?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The farmers are not protesting. Some of the farm organizations are protesting.

Mr. SMATHERS. Testimony in support of this bill was received from Members of Congress, the Department of Agriculture, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Farmers Union, the National Fisheries Institute, the North-

west Horticultural Council, the National Livestock Producers Association, the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, the Growers and Shippers League of Florida, the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, the International Apple Association, and certain shippers, and motor carriers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. One farmer talked to me with respect to this bill, and I said, "The law permits a farmer to haul his agricultural products any time, any place, without any kind of a certificate."

He said, "I did not know that. I was told I could not haul anything from my farm unless this bill is passed."

I said, "They told you wrong. They do not understand the measure."

I must insist that the Senator from Florida does not understand the bill.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Has the Senator from Colorado explained to the Senate that this is a matter which was before a subcommittee of which both the distinguished Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Ohio are members; that the record has not yet been printed; that it is to come before the full committee at an early date; that it is a matter which is very complicated; and that it involves those who have been designated as gypsy truckers? They are the ones who are more interested than is anyone else in this proposed legislation. It is the opposition of the certificated carriers to the so-called gypsy truckers that is involved, rather than agricultural transportation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I have been trying to explain that to the Senate. I am glad the Senator from Ohio has stated it in the way he has, because that is exactly the way it is.

Mr. BRICKER. I understand that the bill is proposed as an amendment to the pending bill. At least 2 days of hearings have been held, but the record is not yet printed. I think the bill should be given more consideration than we can give to it at this time on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield, in order that I may ask the Senator from Ohio a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield for that purpose, if I may do so without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator from Ohio think the Senate subcommittee will act before July 31?

Mr. BRICKER. I do not know whether it will or not. I could give the Senator no assurance as to that. But the matter came before us only within recent weeks, and a hearing was held. There is no reason to rush it through. The Interstate Commerce Commission has issued a regulation which has been sustained by the Supreme Court, and then someone rushes in and wants Congress, without adequate hearing and without a report from the committee, to

overrule both the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. SMATHERS. Before the Senator from Ohio entered the Chamber, I said the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission could be postponed until next year, so that Senators can have an opportunity, as the Senator from Ohio has suggested, to consider the hearings, and then make a recommendation to the full committee and to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. There will be no experience whatsoever upon which to judge either the validity of the order or the way it works unless we have an opportunity to study it. The fact that the court sustained it shows that it is at least within reason. I think we should let it go into effect, and then, if there is any damage done to agriculture, the Senate will remedy the damage.

Mr. SMATHERS. As I understood the Senator, his first argument was that he did not think the Senate should adopt the amendment because he thought there should be more hearings on it.

Mr. BRICKER. The hearings have been concluded, but the record is not yet printed, and it has not yet been submitted to the full committee, of which the Senator from Florida is a member.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator will agree that in view of the legislative calendar which has been submitted to us, there may not be a further opportunity.

Mr. BRICKER. I do not know. We are going to have a committee meeting this week, I hope.

Mr. SMATHERS. As the Senator well knows, the Interstate Commerce Commission did not unanimously approve this order. It is over their signature because division 5, which is the division that handled the question, recommended against this provision, but division 5 was finally overruled. I am not at all anxious to attach the provision to this bill. I should like to have the Senate have an opportunity to vote on the question on its merits. The order goes into effect on September 1, if we do not postpone it. Once it is in effect, we will never have a chance to consider it. The practical result is that the Interstate Commerce Commission is defeating the purpose of the United States Senate.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Certainly the Interstate Commerce Commission had not thwarted the will of the United States Senate at the time it issued the order. It does not affect the farmer in his haulage to the market at all. It affects only the independent truckers. It does not prevent the farmers from leasing their trucks. As the Senator from Colorado said a moment ago, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the order and the record. I do not think we should attach to the pending bill an amendment which will possibly do violence to a measure which is now pending before another committee after hearings have been held.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his state-

ment. I desire to state before I yield again, that the effective date of the Interstate Commerce Commission's order is September 1.

A bill on the subject covered by the amendment has passed the House and is now in the Senate. A subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is studying it, and the committee itself is studying it. Suppose the order becomes effective September 1. Suppose that in the wisdom of the committee and in the wisdom of the Senate the bill which came from the House were finally enacted, and that trip leasing were permitted to the gypsy truckers and everybody else. This is not the last day on earth for trip leasing, providing the bill on the subject passes. In that event, the Interstate Commerce Commission will find that their order has been revoked by Congress. Of course, if that is done, they will permit trip leasing again.

I wish to say once more that Congress created the Interstate Commerce Commission for the very purpose of protecting the public interest. That is what the job of the ICC is. In carrying out their mission of protecting the public interest, they issued an order against the gypsy haulings. As the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio has said, the case went to the Supreme Court. After the Supreme Court upheld the Interstate Commerce Commission, a bill was introduced in the House and was passed by the House. It came to the Senate in the closing hours of this session. No time was lost. Hearings were held. Interested persons were invited to come before the committee, and they came and testified. The hearings have been sent to the Public Printer, but they have not yet been returned. Our subcommittee has not yet acted.

Now an effort is made to attach the amendment as a rider to a bill which is completely foreign to the whole matter. The pending bill ought to be acted on promptly. It is a bill which stands on the President's must list, and must be enacted before Congress can adjourn. This is a delaying amendment that is being offered to the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, the Senator is well aware that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is not anxious to see the amendment attached to the bill. I wonder if the Senator from Colorado will not reassure the Senate by saying that he will do everything possible to provide the Senate with an opportunity to vote on the trip-leasing bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I will not guarantee that the Senate will vote on the bill until after I have read the hearings. I wish to read the hearings.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought the Senator was present at the hearings and heard the testimony.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I was not able to be present at the hearings. I have had to be present in the Committee on Finance, where a whole group of bills was being considered. I could not attend the hearings before the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; I had to stay and work in the Committee on Finance. But hearings were held before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for 2 days. I did not attend them, and I have not had an opportunity to read the transcripts. I was appointed to the subcommittee, so I think I should have an opportunity to fulfill my assignment to that subcommittee in a workmanlike way.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator should have that opportunity, but it does not seem possible that all the farm experts and all the representatives of farm organizations could have been mistaken in their conclusions as to the effect of the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The effect of the order is common knowledge; it has been published all over the United States. The effect is to take money away from farmers, who are having to sustain a falling market, and to give the money to the railroads. According to the New York Journal of Commerce of this morning, the profits of railroads this year will reach an all-time high—at least, since 1949.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is not the matter before the Senate at all.

Mr. AIKEN. While I dislike to see amendments placed on the bill, and I hope there will not be any amendment of the bill, I hope we may have some strong assurance from members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that the Senate will have a chance to pass on the issue. I do not believe in letting committees bottle up bills.

I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will not bottle up a bill so vital, as it is claimed, to so many millions of people. On the other hand, if it is necessary to take action like that proposed, I can well understand the attempt by those who are so vitally concerned with the marketing of farm products to resort to extreme measures to get some action.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have never been a party to the bottling up of any bill, and I have been a Senator for a long time. But I do wish to examine the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the Senator agree that after he had read the testimony, and even though he decided the ICC order should stand, he would then be willing to permit the Senate as a whole to have an opportunity to vote on a measure of this importance? It seems to me that the Senator from Florida might then be willing to withdraw his amendment, because a famine relief bill should go through unscathed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I may wish to amend the bill after I read the hearings. I am certain the Senator from Vermont is completely mistaken about the effect and purpose of the order of the Commission. It does not provide punishment for farmers. Farmers have been treated very generously by the ICC and by Congress, so far as transportation is concerned. Farmers and farm cooperatives have been completely freed from having to be certified to haul agricultural products. That is only a part of our economy.

Congress found it necessary to regulate transportation in the public interest, and the ICC was created for the purpose of regulating transportation. But Congress has been generous in its treatment of farmers, and it should be generous to them, because it is important to all the people that there be widespread and complete distribution of food products in the United States. That is the reason why Congress and the ICC have been generous to farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. If the ICC order is harmless, I am at a loss to understand why farmers and representatives of every farm organization in the country are so gravely concerned with the effect of this ICC order. I hope 6 million farm families and all the high-priced traffic experts are mistaken, but it is difficult to understand how all of them could be mistaken. It is difficult to understand why everyone interested in the railroads should take a stand in opposition—and I am referring to the brotherhoods and to the railroad operators—why should they all be on one side of the question, and why should every farm organization be on the other side? It is indeed a coincidence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot account for the organizations taking the position they are assuming. I know it is true that farm organizations have come out for the bill. I have talked with them and have discussed the matter with them. They have not been able to show me any good reason for their position, or to give any indication that the agriculturists of the United States would suffer, whether or not the bill were passed. I have not received a single letter from farmers, but one farmer from Colorado came to see me about the matter. Colorado and 17 other States do not permit trip leasing. They do not allow the gypsies a free range on the highways of the country. Many of the States do not permit it. Why should we do it now? I cannot see why we should.

The labor organizations are very much opposed to the enactment of this bill. The teamsters union, many of the truck lines, the railroads themselves, railroad employees, and the railroad brotherhoods are unanimously opposed to this measure, because they think that the gypsy truckers are not legitimate competition, and they do not think that they ought to be permitted to operate without a certificate of convenience and necessity as a common or contract carrier.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The question has been raised as to whether the regulation proposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission does affect a farmer transporting his produce. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that by law a farmer or other person transporting agricultural products from the farm to market is exempted from regulation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Agricultural products are exempted from certification. That is correct, whether a farmer hauls them or whether anyone else hauls them.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that prior to the promulgation of the regulation,

MC-43 by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Supreme Court decision, a farmer or a private truck owner who had transported agricultural products to market could haul on the return trip nonagricultural commodities without regulation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Let us keep the two of them separate. Let us talk about the farmer, and then talk about the gypsy.

Mr. COOPER. Let us take the case of the farmer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. All right. Let us talk about the farmer.

Mr. COOPER. Prior to the promulgation of regulation MC-43 a farmer who had taken a load of agricultural products from his farm to market could bring back to his home or to another destination on the return trip a load of merchandise from a carrier regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. He could do that even if this bill were enacted.

Mr. COOPER. He could do it, but only under the regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Is it not true that under regulation he would be required to enter into written contracts, and that the period of the contracts could not be less than 30 days? There are other restrictions which would effectively restrict and discourage hauling on the return trip.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There are restrictions, but they are not onerous restrictions. There are some regulations which the farmer would have to observe if he were hauling back a trip-lease load for some other carrier. Of course he would have to meet certain regulations, but, I repeat, they are not onerous regulations.

Mr. COOPER. It would be very different from the situation today, when a farmer can take a load to market and, on the same day, enter into a contract to bring back a load.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He can do that.

Mr. COOPER. Under the provisions of the regulation proposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, he would not be permitted to enter into any contract whose duration was less than 30 days. He would have to sign the contract. There are many other restrictions. The effect would be to restrict, if not to eliminate, for many farmers, the practice of the return-trip load. That is the reason that farm organizations are for the trip-lease bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If they are against the bill for those reasons—

Mr. COOPER. They are for the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If they are influenced by the considerations described, I do not think we ought to have very much sympathy with them, because certainly it would be no onerous task to make out certain papers when the farmer is hauling something for a certificated carrier. There is nothing difficult about that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator from Kentucky was not in the Chamber when I spoke previously. Regardless of what the merits or lack of merits may be of the trip-lease bill, I make the earnest plea that the Senate not attach it as an amendment to the famine-relief bill, which is a request by the President to meet a very real need in the critical international situation which now faces us. To attach such an amendment might jeopardize the final enactment into law of the famine-relief bill which has been recommended by the President and has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Here at the last minute we have an amendment dealing with an entirely different subject. It is, in fact, a bill on which hearings are presently being held by a committee of the Senate.

While from a purely parliamentary point of view the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is entirely within his rights in offering it as an amendment to the pending bill, and while we have no rule of relevance, so far as that is concerned, I think it demonstrates a very unfortunate situation in the Senate, which may jeopardize a highly important piece of legislation.

The proponents of this measure may not get what they are seeking anyway. I am not suggesting that they try to attach their amendment to any other bill; but of all the bills I would hope they would not attach it to, the pending bill, which we were almost in a position to pass, and which I had hoped to be able to send to the President within a day or so, is the last one to which such an amendment should be attached. I believe that this amendment would jeopardize the prompt enactment of the bill. So while it is entirely proper that this discussion should continue—and it will have to continue so long as the amendment is pending—I hope the distinguished junior Senator from Florida may find it possible to decide not to press his amendment to the pending bill.

He has open to him any number of parliamentary tactics. He can offer his amendment to some bill which is not of such a critical nature. If he feels that he has not been getting a sufficient or fair hearing before the committee to which this measure has been referred, he can always make a motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill. I admit that the Senate is very reluctant to do that. But at least if he feels that he has not had a fair hearing, he can make such a motion. In any event I hope he will not press his amendment to the famine relief bill. That is my only plea.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the acting majority leader to this fact: I presume that the famine relief bill will go to the House Committee on Agriculture. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I think that committee has a comparable bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am quite sure that it will not go to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I should like information on that question. To what committee of the House will the famine relief bill be referred if it is passed by the Senate?

Mr. AIKEN. From the title of the bill, I should suppose that it would go to the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what I thought.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would rather not see the amendment attached to this bill. I agree with the Senator from California in that respect. I think the Senator from Florida very definitely has a case. I cannot conceive of the Interstate Commerce Commission putting into effect an order when the House has overwhelmingly passed legislation nullifying that order, and the same legislation is being processed in the Senate. I cannot conceive of the Interstate Commerce Commission going ahead and placing that order in effect. I am willing to join with any or all other Members of the Senate in requesting that the Interstate Commerce Commission delay the order until the Congress has had an opportunity to act on the proposed legislation. I hope the Senator from Colorado will also join in requesting the Interstate Commerce Commission to postpone the effective date of the order until the Congress has had time to act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the bill which we are now discussing came from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It did not come from the Agriculture Committee. It came from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House. It is proposed to attach to the pending bill an amendment dealing with a subject which was handled by another committee of the House and another committee of the Senate—not the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate or the House Agriculture Committee, but another standing committee of the Senate, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the corresponding House committee. We are dealing with an agricultural bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It might be possible from a parliamentary standpoint—

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is the one which ought to report such a bill. However, I can readily understand the concern of the agricultural community over the possible effect of the Interstate Commerce Commission's order, should it go into effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am perfectly willing to allow the amendment to come to a vote now, so that we can dispose of it.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, it should be pointed out that the bill we are discussing now has already passed the House. It passed by a vote of 3 to 1. There is no reason why the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from

Florida should hold up the famine relief bill in conference for any time at all. I suspect also that we will find some support for this kind of thinking in the Department of Agriculture, and even in the Committee on Agriculture of the House.

We are facing the actual fact that we will not see the order stopped unless we attach the proposed amendment to the bill. It must be attached to a bill which will pass both the House and the Senate. It is the type of legislation which must be attached to such a bill. It is of tremendous importance to the agriculture interests of the United States that some action along this line be taken.

The Senator from Vermont has suggested that he would like to have all Senators join in a resolution asking that the order be held up. I can say to the Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that I know of no better way to pass this type of legislation than to have the entire Senate vote unanimously for the amendment and attach it to a bill which must be enacted by Congress. It is necessary that it be done in that way, if we are to accomplish anything along this line in aid of agriculture. I sincerely hope the Senate will attach the amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Nebraska, inasmuch as he is one of the sponsors of the amendment, whether he would be willing to withdraw the amendment from consideration at this time if the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the former chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would join with his other colleagues on the committee, including the Senator from Ohio, in writing a letter to the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission requesting the Commission to withhold action on its order MC 43 until the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce have an opportunity to hold hearings on the subject and to make recommendations to the Senate?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I would say that I am too new in the Senate to know what effect a letter signed by the three of us would have upon the Interstate Commerce Commission. However, I know that if we adopt the amendment and attach it to the pending bill, and if the bill is enacted by the Senate and the House, it will be a direction to the Interstate Commerce Commission to hold up the order until the 15th of March 1954, giving the committee and Congress plenty of time to make a permanent decision as to the attitude they wish to take on the subject of trip leasing. It is only a stopgap arrangement, and it would give us until the 15th of March 1953 to make up our minds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. What would be so disastrous to agriculture if that order did go into effect and if Con-

gress passed an act next January to cover the situation? No harm would have been done, and whatever action might have been taken under the order would be changed by action of Congress. I repeat that the September 1 date is not the last day on earth.

Mr. GRISWOLD. I would answer the able Senator from Colorado by saying that between the 1st day of September and the 15th of March there will be many crops harvested in our country. I am not so well acquainted with all the crops, but I know something about the potato crop coming out of Alabama during the early part of the year, and there are certain crops which will be coming out of Texas in the early part of the year, before March 15.

I might add that the farmer is sufficiently intelligent to know that he should not be asked to buy all the trucks necessary to move his crops. Tremendous crops are moved in Nebraska. It is impossible for a farmer himself to own a sufficient number of trucks to move his crops. He depends on the so-called gypsy trucker. It is an absolute economic necessity to have that kind of trucking available.

During the war the Office of Defense Transportation issued a flat order requiring the use of trucks for backhauls, because it would be an economic loss to ask a truck to carry a full cargo to one point and then return empty. There are many agricultural products to be moved between the 1st of September and the middle of March, and this type of transportation will be required. The farmers are sufficiently intelligent to know that if they backhaul empty they will have to pay more for transporting their crops. A farmer knows exactly what he is doing when he says he is in favor of trip leasing. He knows a little bit about the subject.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to no man in his desire to pass the legislation pending before the Senate. I compliment the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and all of the members of the committee on reporting this most humanitarian proposal. It is one that I believe will be very vital in furthering our purposes to defeat communism through examples of democratic and humanitarian means.

If I thought for even one-half of a second that the adoption of the amendment which the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has offered, and of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, would endanger the passage of the bill, I would not agree to place it on the bill.

I do not believe that it is ungermane or nonimportant to the pending bill. I have found that the very finest and most enthusiastic and unanimous support of sending food abroad to help the suffering millions of people comes from the farmers of America, whose long hours of backbreaking toil make them wish to see the food used, instead of stored up in warehouses.

The trip-leasing amendment, which does not carry into permanent law any new regulation or any permanent prohibition against the Interstate Commerce Commission, merely asks that the

farmers of America be given an opportunity to have a hearing before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce before the new regulation becomes effective. They should be allowed to tell the committee how important it is to extend the practice that has been a part of the law and a part of current farm operations and farm marketing operations in the delivery to the centers of distribution and consumption of the crops they grow.

Mr. President, if that were not the case we would not have the unanimous support of all the wonderful farm organizations, including the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council on Farm Cooperatives, the National Farmers Union, the National Fisheries Institute, the National Horticultural Exchange, the National Livestock Producers Association, the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries and Directors of Agriculture, the Growers and Shippers League of Florida, the United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, and the National Apple Association, together with the Department of Agriculture, insisting that permanent legislation be passed to stop the order, which will go into effect on September 1.

The junior Senator from Florida and the junior Senator from Oklahoma and the junior Senator from Nebraska are not asking for permanent legislation to stop the order. We are asking only for a stay of execution of the order, which our study has led us to believe, and which has led tariff specialists of all farmer organizations to believe will disastrously affect the pattern of farm marketing throughout the country and will disrupt the trip-leasing services, which has developed because there was a demand for it.

The distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, has stated that "September 1 is not the last day on earth." I will say, Mr. President, that it is the last day on earth for the farm-distribution transportation system which has been developed over years, to get to the markets the products of the farms at the lowest possible cost and by the best possible means of transportation. The system was not subsidized. It was not protected and fostered by any commission or any arm of Government. It developed in hard and free competition because the farmers and the markets needed the auxiliary service. It is the farmer's method of getting his produce to the market.

I do not believe any Senator can argue successfully that adoption of the amendment, thus making possible a temporary continuation of what has proven to be economically feasible in the marketing of agricultural commodities, would be dangerous to the bill.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska has pointed out that the bill will go to conference. The conferees will be composed of members of the House Committee on Agriculture and members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The members of those committees understand better than do

any other Members of the Congress the problems the farmers have.

I venture to say that if the amendment had been referred, in the form of a bill, to the two agricultural committees of the Congress, the bill would have been here on the floor of the Senate as the first order of business months ago, and probably would have been passed by both the House and the Senate by this time.

The amendment will go to conference, along with the bill; and the conferees, who will be members of the House Agricultural Committee and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, are thoroughly acquainted with such matters.

We are confronted with the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission has rather ruthlessly imposed a death sentence upon this form of transportation. It has ruled that that death sentence shall be carried out on September 1. Certainly, at this late hour, we should not quarrel about jurisdictions.

We should not confuse the matter by saying that this subject is before a committee. We are practical men. We know that if this amendment is not adopted on this or some other bill this week, the death sentence regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission will go into effect, and this method of transportation of agricultural commodities will die.

In referring to our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, let me say that all of us are saddened by the great loss which has been suffered by the Senate and, in particular, by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a result of the death of its chairman, the late distinguished and beloved Senator Tobey of New Hampshire. He has been a most outstanding and most valuable Member of the Senate, and it will be impossible to replace him. His service to the Senate has been very great indeed. Thus no action from the committee is to be expected.

So, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to, for it will give a stay of execution until March 15, 1954, in the case of the farmers' trucking service, and during that period of time, Congress can decide on the necessities of the matter.

There is no immediate reason why the Interstate Commerce Commission's order should go into effect on September 1, for this practice has been in existence for many years.

It may be claimed that this practice interferes too much with the Pennsylvania Railroad System or the Illinois Central or the Santa Fe Railroad and other railroads; but certainly those railroads will not go broke between now and March 15, 1954.

On the other hand, if the Interstate Commerce Commission's order is allowed to go into effect on September 1, the result will be the destruction of the farmers' distribution system for fruits and vegetables, which depends upon the system they have helped to build up. If the Commission's order is allowed to go into effect on September 1, the trans-

portation charges will be increased, for the traffic will have to be handled by the regular scheduled truck and railroad lines, whose schedules do not fit the agricultural distribution pattern, and those transportation systems do not have sufficient facilities to handle the necessary distribution.

Mr. President, I regret to have to differ with my friend, the distinguished acting majority leader. If we pass up the opportunity we have to do what I believe is in the minds of three-fourths or more of the Members of this body, then the Senators who vote to pass up this opportunity will have to answer to the farmers for disturbing their distribution and shipping system, and will have to say to them, "We just did not have time to give this matter consideration in the Senate."

Mr. President, the bill passed the House by a wide margin of votes. It was reported from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The House committee charged with jurisdiction of such legislation is friendly to this measure, not hostile to it.

As I have said, the conferees on this bill will be members of the agricultural committees of the two Houses, Members of Congress who have devoted their lives to protecting the farmers against abuse and to taking steps to preserve the things that have proved to be of importance to the farmers. The Senators opposing this talk about the taking of the farmers' produce to market, but they do not say anything about the return haul, which would be prohibited.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I beg the Senator's pardon. The farmer can have a return haul, and so can his cooperative.

Mr. MONRONEY. And so can his trucker?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. He can bring back a load for a common carrier.

Mr. MONRONEY. In his own truck?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, in his own truck.

Mr. MONRONEY. But I am saying that this distribution pattern, which was built up by small independent truckers who serve one group of farmers locally for 1 week, and serve another group for another week, will be denied the right to make return hauls, under the order of the Commission, which I feel goes beyond the clear mandate of Congress in passing the Interstate Commerce Commission Act.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. As a matter of fact, in prohibiting the farmer from using his truck in such a way, is not the Interstate Commerce Commission proceeding by prohibiting the farmer, under this order, from leasing his truck for profit? If he is to get a haul back under the Commission's order he can get it only by leasing his truck for 30 days; but of

course if he were to lease his truck for so long a period, he would be deprived of its use during that entire intervening time.

At this point I should like to refer to the testimony of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture before the committee. He stated that the inevitable result of the Commission's order "will be to force from the highways of our country many of the agricultural truckers hauling exempt agricultural commodities to consuming areas by depriving them of their right to trip-lease their equipment and requiring that all leases be for not less than 30 days."

So, of course, if they have to lease their trucks for 30 days, for all practical purposes they will be deprived of the use of their trucks for that period, and thus their trucks will have to return empty.

The result will be to increase the cost of hauling the produce to the market, and in the last instance that will increase the cost to the consumers.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, we are not asking that the Commission's order be prohibited. We are only begging for a little time, so that the Senate can act in an informed way.

I think these lines are entitled to a fair trial before the death sentence ordered by the Interstate Commerce Commission is administered. This amendment merely will postpone the effective date of the order, until Congress can take a good, thorough look at it.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I think there is considerable confusion in regard to trip leasing.

Extensive hearings were held in 1950 in regard to the trip-leasing practice in the United States. There was much testimony as to the irresponsibility of truckers engaging in that practice and, as a result, damage to the public because of unregulated trucking by gypsy truckers.

The Interstate Commerce Commission held extensive hearings on the matter, and issued an order. It was appealed to the Supreme Court, and the order was sustained by the Supreme Court.

Then the House passed a bill, which now is before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Hearings on the bill have been held by a subcommittee, composed of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] who is chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself. We have not yet had the record of the hearings printed.

Many facts which have been stated in the course of the debate this afternoon certainly are not substantiated by the committee's hearings; but are contrary to the facts which were determined in the course of the hearings. I did not attend all the hearings, but I did attend a portion of them.

I believe it is only fair that the Senate look into that record, before it attaches this amendment to a bill coming from another committee.

After the hearings held by the House committee and the passage of the bill by the House and the hearings held by the Senate committee, and while the Senate committee is still considering the bill, it is inconceivable to me that the Interstate Commerce Commission would put the order into effect, unless there is clear and convincing evidence that it should be put into effect and that irreparable damage will be done if it is not.

The order will not affect to the serious degree which has been implied by some Senators the hauling of agricultural commodities. The order does not affect in any way the right of a farmer or a cooperative to use a truck for the transportation of produce to market. Most agricultural commodities are hauled in that way or are hauled by regular, certificated regulated truckers, on a regular route or routes. The truckers who have been certificated comply with the law and comply with the restrictions and regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission and those of the various State commissions.

Let me say for the Senator who is chairman of the subcommittee that on April 1, 1953, he was named chairman of the subcommittee for consideration of the Senate bill. There seemed to be no great interest in the bill, and hearings on it were not held until the House passed its bill and until that bill came to the Senate. The hearings were held on July 8. They have not yet been printed. Certainly the Senate would not be justified in attaching to the very important bill which is now pending, and which is of an emergent character, this amendment, which would constitute permanent legislation. It involves a matter which is very technical in detail, and which should have very thorough consideration, not only on the floor of the Senate, but in the committee where the bill is lodged at the present time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Ohio for yielding to me. In saying that the Senate should have time to examine the record of the hearings and fully debate the subject before it postpones the execution date of the order affecting the distribution of agricultural commodities, I think the Senator from Ohio means that before the order of the Commission is allowed to go into effect, the Senate should read the record and become familiar with the problem. That is exactly what the junior Senator from Florida and his associates are trying to have done; they are trying to give the Senate an opportunity to understand the problem before the present method of business is completely wiped out and severed from our transportation system.

Mr. BRICKER. I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Oklahoma that, even if the situation which he depicts exists, the House has passed the bill, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has it under consideration, and I cannot conceive that the Interstate Commerce Commission would fail to recognize that fact and, if irreparable damage would follow, if the agri-

cultural industry would be injured, if farm transportation would be in anyway handicapped, would of its own volition, suspend the effective date of its order until the Congress could act on the question at the next session.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, first I may say I want to congratulate the able acting majority leader for having, a moment ago, made the very constructive suggestion that an effort be made to find a bill to which this amendment could be attached. When he made that suggestion I wondered whether he had in mind any specific legislation to which the amendment might be attached, rather than attaching it to the pending measure. Would he, as acting majority leader, be willing to suggest a measure to which we could attach this amendment, and then, to speak in behalf of the amendment and to give it the very great weight and support which he carries in the Senate?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. I may say to the Senator, in complete frankness, I merely plead with him not to seek to put it on the pending measure, because, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have sat with the President at the White House, and heard him, not once, but on several occasions, point out the great interest he had and the great urgency he feels with respect to this famine relief bill, in order to meet situations which may arise when Congress will not be in session, such as the situation in eastern Germany. A situation might develop in some of the other Iron-Curtain countries, or in countries under threat of being taken behind the Iron Curtain, when such a provision would be extremely important.

I do urge that the Senator not seek to attach the amendment to the pending measure. I may say in frankness to the Senator from Florida that I would not want to tell him that I would agree to support his amendment if it were offered to some other measure, because, frankly, I have not had an opportunity to study it, I have not read the hearings, the bill has not been reported from the committee, and certainly, without having more facts than I now have, I have merely an open mind on it. I do not know whether I would support it or oppose it, because the question involved is not one to which I have had an opportunity to give any study; and, of course, I did not expect this provision to be offered as an amendment to the famine relief bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from California. I am sure, of course, that he and the President, who now guides the destinies of the Nation, are interested in the welfare of the farmer. I am also sure that if the able Senator from California and the President of the United States actually knew what was likely to happen to the farmers of the United States and the consumers under this proposed order of the ICC, there would be considerably more interest in the legislation on the subject which is now pending than has thus far been evidenced. I fear that if the pending bill is disposed of at the present time, and if we do not take ac-

tion now to forestall the future action on the part of the ICC, we shall never hear of trip leasing again. Tomorrow we shall go on with other matters and the little man—the little trucker—or the “gypsy,” as he has been referred to—will have pressed down upon his brow further discrimination and further troubles, and the pending bill granting him relief will be forgotten.

I should like, in a moment, to clear up what the Senator from Ohio called “just a little bit of confusion.”

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield, would he feel that it would be completely strange to discuss transportation in relation to supplying food to starving millions? In every bill we have passed for European relief we have given particular attention to providing that 50 percent of the commodities shipped on the high seas should be carried in American bottoms. So this is not a new suggestion, but is very basic to the agricultural economy, which makes possible the production of the food supplies by means of which we are able to aid the starving peoples elsewhere.

So I do not think it is nongermane, or a proposal of which we should be fearful, since in every relief bill I can recollect, including that providing for wheat for Pakistan and wheat for India, there have been attached on the floors of the Senate and House the same transportation amendments. But this one is fundamental. It helps the farmers. I should like to see Senators given a chance to indicate how they feel about it.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Oklahoma. I may say that possibly the reason why I am not getting more support for my amendment is that I am taking into consideration the welfare of the little “gypsy” who is trying to make a living out of driving his truck up and down the highways, transporting farm products from the farms to the communities where they may be sold.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I am sympathetic toward what he is trying to do, but I sincerely regret that an effort is being made to place this amendment on the pending bill. I wonder whether, in order to insure passage of the pending bill, it would be bold of me to suggest that those of us—and I am sure it includes a great majority of the Senate—who are interested in the Senator's proposal, circulate a petition among Senators, to be presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission, appealing to the Commission not to place its order into effect. I may ask the Senator from Florida whether he would not think that would be fair.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Kansas very much. I do not know whether he would have a suggestion with respect to attaching the amendment to any other bill which we

may hope to have passed before the July 31 recess.

Mr. CARLSON. I may say I have not attempted to check to find out whether there is any other bill to be passed before the adjournment to which the amendment could be attached. If there is, I would try to be very helpful in having it taken up in connection with that bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. With reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas in regard to filing a petition signed by a majority of the Members of the Senate with the Interstate Commerce Commission, it is my personal opinion that a majority of the Senators would be willing to request the ICC to postpone the September 1 order. Of course, I have not attended all of the hearings, though I have attended several of them. In the event a majority of the Senators were unwilling to join in filing such a petition, or if a sufficient number of Senators to make the petition effective were not willing to join in it, I certainly would join the Senator from Florida in undertaking to secure adoption of his amendment on any bill which might be before the Senate between now and the end of the session.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry whether he would consider reporting favorably a resolution from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission not to invoke its order MC-43, at least until the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had had an opportunity to act upon it.

Mr. AIKEN. I could not speak for the entire committee, of the membership of which I observe the presence of only five on the floor at this time. That had not occurred to me, and I am unable to speak for the 15 members of the committee. I should, however, be glad to present the proposition to them. It seems to me that there are many Members of the Senate who, regardless of how they feel on the trip-leasing bill, would like to see a postponement of the September 1 order until the Senate could determine how it desires to vote on the trip-leasing bill, and I would do everything I could to that end.

Mr. SMATHERS. I appreciate the remarks and the attitude of the Senator from Vermont. I may say I am but 1 of 4 sponsors of the amendment which is before the Senate. The able junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has long evidenced his interest in the farmer, as have the chairman of the subcommittee, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], and the able junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], who has long been known as one who has been in the forefront of the battles for the farmer, and particularly the battles of the little farmer, who for some reason has been unduly castigated here today.

Now, while Senators are conducting a little poll, I wish to proceed by saying that, so far as the point in issue is concerned, I think that it ought to be made clear for the record.

I would say to the able Senator from Colorado, that the whole purpose of the amendment is to stop the Interstate Commerce Commission from invoking what amounts to an edict requiring each farmer to lease his truck on a return trip for 30 days. That is one of the reasons—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like the Senator to be more accurate in his statements about the operation of the Commission's order. The Interstate Commerce Commission modified its MC-43 order, making it possible for farmers to take a trip lease on their return and for the farmer cooperatives to have a trip-lease on their return. It amended its order.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have the highest respect for the senior Senator from Colorado, and I have the greatest affection for him, but I respectfully say to him that that is not at all what the Secretary of Agriculture thinks; it is not what the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture thinks; it is not what every man who served on the House committee and studied this problem thinks. As a matter of fact, it is completely contrary to the committee report, the testimony before the House committee, and everything that I have been told.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to say that the only way I can account for the completely diametrical position—and I have the very highest regard for the Senator from Florida; I am sure my regard for him equals any regard he has for any other Senator—

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But the only way I can explain or try to explain this confusion is that the Interstate Commerce Commission itself modified and corrected its order MC-43. Perhaps the Senator from Florida is talking about that order before it was changed, because the Interstate Commerce Commission modified it and changed it so that the farmer can haul his produce to market without certification.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the Senator know on what day the Commission changed the order?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not.

Mr. SMATHERS. As of June 8, 1953, it had not modified or changed it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Commission changed it on May 18, 1953. I said I did not know, but I have a statement here from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission saying that on May 18, 1953, the Commission made those changes. If the Senator will look it up he will find that the changes were made as I have stated.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me read a letter dated April 14, 1953. So far as I

know, the order has not been amended or changed. This letter is from the Secretary of Agriculture, addressed to Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives. I read:

These carriers, including those controlled and operated by farm cooperatives, individual farmers transporting their own products and for-hire truckers, are exempt from the certificate requirements of the Interstate Commerce Act under section 203 (b) thereof. Not being subject to such requirements, these carriers can and do render an expeditious and highly flexible transportation service to the agricultural community. Agricultural producers and shippers are largely dependent upon the services of such carriers who, in many instances, operate directly from farms to consignees located in distant cities.

Regulations recently promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, requiring that all leases of motor-carrier equipment be for a minimum period of 30 days and be for the exclusive use of the leased equipment, destroy the economical and efficient utilization of motor-carrier equipment inherent in this trip-leasing practice.

That is what the Secretary of Agriculture says. Is he wrong?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. He is not wrong when he is talking about the gypsies, but he is wrong when he is talking about the farmers.

Mr. SMATHERS. He did not mention the gypsies.

I might go on to say that in the House report is this statement:

The amended bill here being reported involves an issue extremely vital to agriculture, truckers of agricultural commodities, shippers of livestock and fish, and many motor carriers.

It involves a question as to whether or not the agricultural community, in particular, and the public generally, are to be deprived of a flexibility and an economy in the transportation of agricultural products, livestock, and fish, to market by motor vehicle. It involves a question as to whether or not the practice of trip leasing of motor vehicles by regulated motor carriers—a practice which has been in existence for many years even antedating the Motor Carrier Act of 1935—is to be continued or drastically curtailed and even abolished.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have been told by a Commissioner of the Interstate Commerce Commission that the House committee had a misunderstanding of the very thing about which we are talking. If they had that kind of testimony, it was erroneous testimony. If they believed that testimony, they were misguided.

Mr. SMATHERS. The committee goes on to say in the report:

If the Commission's 30-day lease rule is permitted to take effect as scheduled, the agricultural community, and shippers of livestock and fish, will be seriously hampered in the marketing of their products, and the ultimate consumer will be forced to pay higher prices for these products. It would undoubtedly put out of business a substantial number of truckers, largely those engaged in hauling agricultural commodities.

It would, in consequence, have the effect of impairing the agricultural and other exemptions provided for in section 203 (b) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

The reported bill will permit the continuation of trip leasing which is so vital to agriculture, haulers of agricultural commodities, livestock, fish, and many motor carriers. It will assist the Commission in the promotion of safety of operation and equipment and carrier responsibility. It will preserve the economy and flexibility which has characterized trip leasing for many years. It will retain the privileges which Congress has granted to agriculture and the other enumerated products under section 203 (b) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act.

We urge prompt enactment of this legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Florida asked me to become one of the sponsors of this amendment, I gave the matter careful thought. I am deeply interested in strengthening the foreign relations of our country and I want this relief bill to be passed. I agree that this is a bill which ordinarily should not carry an amendment such as the one we are considering. But the amendment and the trip-lease problem deserves discussion. I sincerely hope that out of the discussion there may be a way devised which will permit the trip-lease bill to be brought to the floor of the Senate for debate and for a vote, or that at least a resolution will be adopted recommending to the Interstate Commerce Commission that its order be not put into effect until next March.

This amendment points up the situation with which farmers are faced. It has been said and I know with the greatest sincerity that the ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission, if it is made effective, will have a direct effect upon farmers and truck owners who transport agricultural commodities to market.

Mr. President, how did the situation arise? In 1951 the Interstate Commerce Commission promulgated an order, MC-43, which placed under its regulation, the hauling of non-agricultural products by farmers and others on the return trip, after carrying agricultural commodities to market.

The order was questioned in the courts. The case went to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court held to the facts before it and the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission under the then existing statutes, ruled in substance that when agricultural commodities are transported to market under the exemption granted to them and on the return trip carry nonagricultural commodities, such hauling is subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. An exemption is granted by law to the hauling of agricultural commodities, whether by farmers or by private truck owners. Prior to the decision of the Court, trucks on return trips could carry nonagricultural commodities, and were not subject to regulation. Under the ruling of the Court, they will be subject to regulation if the trip-lease bill is not passed.

It is true, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has said, that there is nothing in the decision of the Court on the proposed regulation which will prevent a farmer who owns a truck and who transports agricultural products, from continuing to haul non-agricultural merchandise on the return trip. But before he can do so, he must place himself under the regulations contained in the order promulgated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The practical effect of the regulations would so restrict farmers as to make it difficult for farmers to carry merchandise on the return trip, and in many cases uneconomical to haul his crops to market at all.

The purpose of the amendment which has been proposed is simply to assure that the Interstate Commerce Commission will not take final action until next March and until there has been an opportunity for full hearings to be completed and a vote taken.

It has been argued by my friend, the Senator from Colorado, true, that unless some limitation and regulation is placed upon the practice of hauling nonagricultural commodities on return trips, the privilege will be abused and there is need for their regulation. Conversely, unless the Interstate Commerce Commission withholds its regulation, farmers and other truckowners will be prevented from transporting their crops to market in the most economic way.

As I have said, this bill is not one to which the amendment should be offered, but the trip-lease problem needed to be settled. It needs action. It is not getting any action in the Senate, although it has passed the House. In the interest of thousands of farmers throughout the country, some provision should be made at this session to assure the postponement of the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission until the Congress decides what shall be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a very brief quotation from a letter of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The letter is dated July 7, 1953, and is from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I wish to read this excerpt, because it touches one other phase of the matter about which we have been speaking tonight.

By removing our authority to regulate the term of the lease and the compensation to be paid thereunder—

The bill denies the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to have anything to say about the compensation. One of the greatest powers and responsibilities of the ICC is to establish rates of transportation in the public interest.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. I wish to read this statement; then I shall sit down. It is just a short sentence.

Mr. SMATHERS. Very well.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall resume reading the quotation:

By removing our authority to regulate the term of the lease and the compensation to be paid thereunder, any effective regulation of leasing is made impossible. In this connection, it should be pointed out that H. R. 3203 provides that the Commission shall have no authority to regulate the amount of compensation to be paid for the use of any motor vehicle. Our regulations provide that the compensation shall not be computed on the basis of any division or percentage of any applicable rate or rates. We were dealing with the manner or method of computing the compensation and not with the amount of such compensation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. COOPER rose.

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. In response to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado, that was exactly what I was saying a few minutes ago. The bill which was passed in the House may not take into consideration the problem which the Senator has suggested. It may well be that the exemptions which have been granted are too far reaching. It may be true that the Interstate Commerce Commission ought to have the power to regulate and to prevent too great an extension of the exemptions.

But looking at the situation from the viewpoint of the farmer, if the promulgation of the order is not deferred, it will effectively prevent him, in most cases, from hauling merchandise on the return of a trip to market with his crops.

It seems to me that the best thing to do is to provide an opportunity for a hearing before the order goes into effect, so that a proper method of regulation can be worked out fair to farmers and regulated carriers.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Florida may not lose the floor by reason of yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. I know of no measure before Congress which has created more concern among the farming population than the trip-leasing bill. Their concern has not been fear that the bill might pass, but fear that the bill might not pass, and apprehension over what might happen to the income of many farmers if they were required to use trucks for long hauls which could be loaded in only one direction.

As I say, it has been of great concern to the farming population, and has the united support of all the farm organizations, which have disagreed vigorously in many other matters which have come before Congress.

I do not like to see such an amendment to the bill, which is purely a humanitarian bill, providing that the President may use surplus commodities to relieve distress in other countries. So I am willing to do everything possible to get the Interstate Commerce Commis-

sion to defer the effective date of the order, which is at present September 1. As I said, I do not see how the order can be put into effect, because a bill nullifying it has passed the House by an overwhelming vote and is pending in the Senate.

But to make certain that the Interstate Commerce Commission understands how the Senate feels, I am willing to lay the matter before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at the earliest possible date, requesting the ICC to hold in abeyance its order, which otherwise would go into effect September 1. It cannot be tomorrow, because some Senators are attending the funeral of Senator Tobey. It would have to be after tomorrow.

Mr. President, in the interest of saving time, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may meet while the Senate is in session, possibly Wednesday afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRICKER. Reserving the right to object, is it the thought of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to have his committee take jurisdiction of the trip-leasing bill?

Mr. AIKEN. It is not. The matter which would be presented to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry undoubtedly would be in the form of a joint resolution requesting the Interstate Commerce Commission to defer its order, now slated to become effective September 1, until the Senate could pass on the merits of the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, from the colloquy which has taken place on the floor I think one thing is clear, and that is that there is some disagreement—certainly in the minds of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Florida—as to just what is in this bill. I think it is also very clear that it is a most important measure, affecting the farmers of the United States and every consumer, because it is clear that if the cost of transportation goes up—which it would—it would finally affect every person who ever sat around a table and partook of food.

In view of what the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee [Mr. AIKEN] has said, and after having checked with my cosponsors, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and finding each of them in a most amiable and compromising mood, in view of the approaching end of the session; because the able acting majority leader has indicated that he will give kindly consideration to this legislation; and in view of the steps which are to be taken, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has a right to

withdraw his amendment without unanimous consent.

Mr. SMATHERS. I then withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington at this stage?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would object to the adoption of the amendment, but I have no objection to the Senator offering his amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was momentarily absent from the Chamber making a telephone call when the bill was ordered to a third reading. I hope I shall not be precluded from offering my amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. All I was making clear was that unanimous consent was not being given for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the amendment at this time? The Chair hears none, and the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 9, after the word "appropriate", it is proposed to delete the period and continue as follows: "Provided, That at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities made available under this act and transported from the United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent practicable, and to the extent that such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I am offering this amendment to this bill just as I have offered it in connection with every other foreign-aid bill, whether it had the humanitarian aspects and purposes of this bill, or whether it related purely to economic aid, military aid, or any other type of aid. The same language has been placed in 13 of the so-called foreign-aid measures. It was also placed in two bills of exactly the same nature as this, namely, in the Indian Emergency Food Act of 1951, and the Yugoslavia Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950.

The purpose of the amendment is, of course, obvious. The Senate has approved this principle on many occasions. As a matter of fact, the Foreign Relations Committee has placed the same language in many bills. I was hoping that it could be placed in the pending bill.

There has been some suggestion that, this being a humanitarian bill, providing for something in the nature of a gift, we should not add any commercial aspects

to it. However, I cannot distinguish between this bill and other foreign-aid bills, particularly the Indian wheat bill and the Yugoslavia emergency relief bill. I think it is only fair, in cases in which we transport goods for our own benefit and for the benefit of the free world, that we pay attention to the fact that without the American merchant marine as the fourth arm of defense, our system of defense would not be complete. Without an adequate American merchant marine during World War II we might not have had a free world.

We subsidized the American merchant marine to some extent. The bulk of the cargoes nowadays, particularly governmental cargoes, are in connection with foreign aid. This trade was a lifesaver to the American merchant marine after World War II, because it was able to participate in such shipments. I think it is only fair that it should continue to participate under the terms of the pending bill.

If we depart in this instance from the precedent which has been established, we may be setting a precedent which will prove unfortunate in the future. The 50-50 participation is a modest requirement. We have the ships. The State Department, which objected to the same provision in the first act, in 1948, the ECA Act, and said that it could not comply with it, found that it could comply with such a provision. I think the figure is now around 60 percent.

If the distinguished Senator from Vermont feels that perhaps this provision should not be in the pending bill because of the lateness of the hour and the fact that the bill must go to the House, I should be glad to withdraw the amendment if the Senator would agree—and I am sure the House would accede to the suggestion—that there be placed in the conference report the statement that it is expected that this provision, which has been in all previous foreign aid bills, will be carried out in connection with these shipments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is a difference between this bill and the other foreign-aid bills. In connection with other foreign-aid bills the country to be aided was definitely known. In this case it is not known what country we may be called upon to aid. The committee considered the proposal offered by the Senator from Washington, and decided that it was best not to tie the hands of the President, because we do not know what kind of emergency may arise. We do expect that the normal channels of trade will be used to the fullest extent practicable. To use the language of the report:

To the maximum extent practicable consistent with good business practices and the purposes of the act, the normal channels of trade should be utilized in carrying out the act.

The chairman of the committee is willing to state now that, in connection with relief matters, when the country to be aided is known the precedent of utilizing 50 percent American shipping has been pretty well established.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At least 50 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. At least 50 percent of American shipping for carrying the goods, when the shipping is available. However, it is entirely possible that we might be called upon to aid a country with respect to which water transportation might not be the feasible way of doing the job. We might need an airlift.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that I am speaking only of cases in which it is intended to ship dry cargo and bulk cargo. If it were intended to use air transportation or other transportation, this provision would have no application.

I wonder if the Senator would agree to include in the conference report the statement that, insofar as it is practicable, it is hoped that in the shipment of these commodities to whatever country they may be shipped, the proportion of 50-50 in shipping will be carried out.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think it is necessary. The chairman, of course, cannot speak for the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand.

Mr. AIKEN. Personally, I would rather not see amendments attached to the pending bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would withdraw my amendment if the Senator would try to have that language placed in the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that this very question was discussed in the committee. I recall clearly that one of the subjects which was brought up for discussion was the question of what might have been done in the case of the Dutch disaster, when the levees yielded and a large area of the country was flooded by the North Sea. Someone commented that if there were a lack of food in the Netherlands or in any of the Scandinavian countries, at least they might be able to contribute shipping, so as to reduce the cost to us, or make it possible for more food to be moved within the authorized appropriations. The Senator from Vermont, I am sure, will recall that that instance was mentioned, and that that was the reason for omitting the provision from the pending bill.

I would certainly have no opposition at all to have the RECORD show—in fact, it will show, as the Senator from Vermont and I are quoted in the RECORD—that in the normal case of movement by ship, when the receiving country does not have a great amount of shipping vessels of its own, we would expect the same rule to apply as now applies under the acts which the distinguished Senator from Washington has mentioned.

I hope for that reason he will see fit to withdraw his amendment at this time and if there be a conference will be completely willing to have included in the conference report similar word-

ing to that suggested by the Senator. However, I am sure he can see the justice in the statement of the chairman of the committee that if an emergency should arise in a country which has ample shipping we should not put a fixed, binding provision in the bill, as willing as we are to have the customary provision applied to the normal handling of food supplies to nations that do not have large means of shipping available.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct in his statement. The Senator from Vermont is perfectly willing to agree that under normal conditions, when the country involved does not have a surplus amount of shipping, not less than 50 percent of it should be shipped in American bottoms. I do not believe that we should tie the hands of the President, because we do not know what countries are to be helped.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We would not tie the hands of the President. There is plenty of our shipping available for any country in the world.

Mr. AIKEN. There may be an emergency which would require an airlift, for example.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amendment would apply only to commodities shipped by water. If all of this material were to be shipped by air, the amendment would not apply at all. There are plenty of ships available. The truth of the matter is—and the reason I am so insistent on making the record—that prior to the several amendments adopted to bills such as this, the practice in the State Department always was, when we were giving something away to another country, for that country to say, "We will come over and pick it up."

The result was that in the early days, under the old ECA arrangement, more than 50 percent of our foreign commerce, offshore commerce, was shipped in that way. If we had not changed that practice it would have cost us much more in merchant-marine subsidies. It has been a godsend to the merchant marine. That has been done frequently in the past, and that is why I am so insistent upon it in the case of this bill.

Furthermore, in the report there appears the phrase "normal channels of trade." There are always some persons in Government who, when they read "normal channels of trade," will say, "Well, the foreign-flag registry travels that route, and that is a normal channel of trade."

From sad experience we have found that we have had to handle it in the way proposed by my amendment. A similar provision has been attached to 13 bills. Perhaps now they are glad the provision has been attached to prior acts, because they established the routes involved.

Of course, I can see that in this instance the situation is a little different; but I hope the conference report will again remind those who are in charge of the matter that we have our own merchant marine that needs cargoes, just as much as the people we are helping need relief.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment on the basis

of the kind cooperation of both the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of the President's message of June 30th, the bill as passed by the Senate, and the report of the committee accompanying the bill made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the message of the President, the text of the bill, and the report of the committee (No. 631) were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

Because of the great productivity of our farms, the people of the United States have been able, on several occasions in recent years, to come to the aid of friendly countries faced with famine. In 1951 agricultural supplies were provided to India, and only recently wheat has been made available to the people of Pakistan. In both instances we were able to provide assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements by using stocks of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. On each of these occasions the Congress has been forced to add consideration of these emergency programs to its very heavy workload. This procedure not only adds to the congressional burden but also slows the speed with which this Government can come to the assistance of a nation urgently needing relief.

I therefore believe it advisable to have general legislation which, within appropriate limitations, would permit the President to meet these situations. The legislation I am requesting would give the President the authority to utilize agricultural commodities held by this Government, but it would limit that authority to meet only the occasional needs arising from famine or other urgent relief requirements.

The objectives of such a program are not to be confused with the principal objective of our mutual-security program. The mutual-security program aims at promoting the long-range security of the United States by assisting our friends to strengthen their long-range economic and defensive capabilities. The program I am now proposing aims at mitigating the hard blows of unusual and urgent emergencies.

Since we cannot adequately foresee the specific needs to be met under the legislation I am requesting, we cannot now determine the most effective and equitable conditions under which such assistance may be rendered in a particular situation. Consequently, I am requesting authority to establish, when the need arises, the terms and conditions under which these agricultural commodities shall be made available.

In order that there may be a minimum of delay in assisting nations stricken with famine or having other urgent relief requirements, I am requesting that the Commodity Credit Corporation be given authority to make available from its stocks the necessary agricultural commodities to meet these emergency needs. To prevent impairment of

the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to permit necessary budgetary adjustments, I am recommending an authorization to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent of its investment in commodities furnished by it, plus any other costs, including interest, which it may incur in carrying out programs authorized under this act. When the costs of any program carried out under the terms of this act can be ascertained, the Congress will be asked to appropriate the necessary funds to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. I further propose that the authority to undertake programs of famine and other urgent relief assistance under this legislation expire on June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1953.

S. 2249

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to enable the President to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President out of its stocks such agricultural commodities as he may request for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations. Not more than \$100 million (including the Corporation's investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all transfers under this section. The President may make such transfer through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriations or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this act after March 15, 1954.

REPORT NO. 631—EMERGENCY FAMINE ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2249) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owner by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States, having considered same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

S. 2249 was introduced pursuant to the request of the President, set out herein as exhibit A. Its purposes to enable him to furnish emergency assistance in the form of agricultural commodities to friendly peoples suffering from famine or other urgent relief problems. Several times during past years Congress and the President have acted, and acted promptly, in extending such assistance, and Congress is prepared promptly to consider recommendations for assistance in the future. This authority may be especially

necessary when Congress is not in session. As introduced, the bill contained a termination date of June 30, 1955, but your committee felt that a termination date of March 15, 1954, would cover the period Congress will not be in session and a sufficient period after Congress meets again.

In view of the shortness of the period for which the bill would be effective and the fact that Congress will be in session for a considerable period before the bill's termination date, it was felt that \$100 million would be sufficient to take care of any emergencies which might occur, and the assistance which may be furnished under the bill would consequently be limited to that sum by committee amendment. Some consideration was given to limiting the amount available for assistance to any one country, but situations as to need, size of population, and other factors would vary so greatly that the committee felt this must be left to the discretion and wisdom of the President.

As introduced, the bill provided for assistance to friendly nations.

The committee feared that this might restrict it to peoples whose governments are friendly, whereas the real purpose of the bill is also to help those of good will who need our help and have our sympathy. The committee amendment in this regard would make it clear assistance may be furnished to friendly populations if it can be assured that the assistance will reach them.

The committee realizes that the furnishing of assistance of this sort must necessarily have some effect on the economy of the recipient country, as well as exporting countries, commercial suppliers and others. The desire of the committee is simply to furnish aid on behalf of our Nation to those in need, and such aid should be furnished in such manner as to avoid all possible injury to the domestic economy of any friendly country or the channels of commercial trade. To the maximum extent practicable consistent with good business practices and the purposes of the act, the normal channels of trade should be utilized in carrying out the act.

In order that Congress may be fully advised on the manner in which any programs under the bill may be working, the committee intends to request a full report thereon shortly after Congress convenes in January.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5141) to create the Small Business Administration and to preserve small business institutions and free, competitive enterprise.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5349) authorizing the United States Government to reconvey certain lands to W. C. Pallmeyer and E. M. Cole.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the benefit of the Senate I should like to say that I intend to move that the military public works bill be made the unfinished business of the Senate. I shall not ask that the Senate take it up until tomorrow morning. Following the making of the bill the unfinished business of the Senate

I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the majority leader plan, following the consideration of the military public works bill, to move the consideration of the immigration-refugee bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That will be taken up tomorrow. I am not sure of the order, but it is planned to take up that bill tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it the intention of the Senator from California to have an evening session tomorrow?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There will be an evening session tomorrow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from California for the information.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2491, the military public works bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2491) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for the Alaska communication system, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

INCORPORATION OF NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1105) to incorporate the National Safety Council, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Melvin H. Baker, Lawrence D. Bell, James B. Black, S. Bruce Black, Morgan B. Brainard, John W. Carpenter, Ray Carr, William G. Chandler, Kenneth B. Colman, Frederick C. Crawford, Walter J. Cummings, Richard R. Deuprel, Benjamin F. Fairless, Wallace Falvey, Francis J. Gavin, George A. Jacoby, George E. Leighty, Horace P. Liveridge, Henry E. North, Thomas I. Parkinson, W. S. S. Rodgers, A. V. Rohweder, William A. Simpson, Lee E. Skeel, W. A. Stewart, John Stilwell, J. E. Trainer, and Juan T. Trippe, and their successors, are hereby created a body corporate, the name of which shall be the "National Safety Council."

SEC. 2. The purposes of this corporation shall be (a) to further, encourage, and promote methods and procedures leading to increased safety, protection, and health, in industries, in homes, on streets and highways, and in other public and private places; (b) to collect, correlate, distribute, and disseminate educational and informative data, reports, and all other data relative to safety methods and procedures; (c) to encourage the adoption and institution of safety methods by all persons, corporations, and other organizations; (d) to organize, establish, and conduct programs, lectures, and other activities for the education of all persons, corporations, and other organizations

in safety methods and procedures; (e) to organize, and to aid in the organization of, local safety chapters throughout the Nation, and to provide organizational guidance and materials to promote the national safety; (f) to cooperate with, enlist, and develop the cooperation of and between all persons, corporations, and other organizations and agencies, both public and private, engaged or interested in, or in any manner connected with, any or all of the foregoing purposes; (g) to do any and all lawful acts which may be necessary, useful, suitable, desirable, and proper for the furtherance, accomplishment, and attainment of any or all of the foregoing purposes.

SEC. 3. The corporation (a) shall have perpetual succession; (b) may charge and collect membership dues and receive contributions of money or property to be devoted to carrying out the purposes of the organization; (c) may sue or be sued; (d) may adopt a corporate seal and alter it at pleasure; (e) may adopt and alter a constitution and by-laws not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States or of any State; (f) may establish and maintain offices for the conduct of its business; (g) may appoint or elect officers and agents; (h) may choose a governing board, of not less than 15 persons, to conduct the business and exercise the powers of the corporation; (i) may acquire, by purchase, device, bequest, gift, or otherwise, and hold, encumber, convey, or otherwise dispose of such real and personal property as may be necessary or appropriate for its corporate purposes; and (j) generally may do any and all lawful acts necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes for which the corporation is created.

SEC. 4. The corporation shall, on or before the first day of December in each year, transmit to Congress a report of its proceedings and activities for the preceding calendar year, including the full and complete statement of its receipts and expenditures. Such reports shall not be printed as public documents.

SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, on June 8, 1953, the Senate passed S. 1105, to incorporate the National Safety Council. The House passed the bill with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not catch the first part of the Senator's statement.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The bill is for the purpose of incorporating the National Safety Council.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it the plan of the distinguished Majority Leader to take up the conference report on the Interior appropriation bill this evening?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; after the Senate has concluded consideration of executive business. Under my prior commitment to the Senate, which I believe is a sound policy, we shall have a quorum call and a yea and nay vote on both treaties, inasmuch as a two-thirds vote is required to ratify the treaties.

After the conclusion of consideration of executive business, which I do not believe will be prolonged, I shall move that the Senate resume consideration of legislative business. At that time I shall ask to have the conference report on the Interior appropriation bill laid before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from California.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATION CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate Executive R, 83d Congress, 1st session, the International Telecommunication Convention, with annexes, and the final protocol to the convention, which was signed at Buenos Aires, on December 22, 1952, by delegates of the United States of America and delegates of other countries represented at the International Telecommunication Conference, Buenos Aires, 1952. The State Department officials state they know of no reason why it should not be made public. Without objection, therefore, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith (1) the international telecommunication convention, with annexes, and (2) the final protocol to the convention, which were signed at Buenos Aires on December 22, 1952, by delegates of the United States of America and delegates of other countries represented at the International Telecommunication Conference, Buenos Aires, 1952.

Although it appears that the convention was signed in five languages, namely, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish, this Government has received up to this time from the depositary, the Government of Argentina, cer-

tified copies only in English and French. Those certified copies are transmitted herewith.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report which the Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to this matter, together with the documentary matter submitted therewith.

In the event that the Senate advises and consent to ratification of the convention and final protocol, it is requested that the Senate do so with the understanding that such ratification will be subject to the declarations which were made by the United States delegates in signing the convention and which are set forth in item X of the final protocol, namely:

Signature of this Convention for and in the name of the United States of America constitutes, in accordance with its constitutional processes, signature also on behalf of all territories of the United States of America.

The United States of America formally declares that the United States of America does not, by signature of this Convention on its behalf, accept any obligation in respect of the Telephone Regulations or the Additional Radio Regulations referred to in Article 12 of the Buenos Aires Convention.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, July 27, 1953.

PROTOCOL PROLONGING INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING REGULATION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive L, 83d Congress, 1st session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the protocol.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Executive L, 83d Congress, 1st session, a protocol dated in London, August 31, 1952, prolonging the international agreement regarding the regulation and marketing of sugar, signed in London on May 6, 1937.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Malone
Anderson	Griswold	Martin
Barrett	Hayden	McClellan
Beall	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Mundt
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bush	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Payne
Byrd	Humphrey	Potter
Capehart	Hunt	Purtell
Carlson	Ives	Robertson
Case	Jackson	Russell
Chavez	Jenner	Saltanstill
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Daniel	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kefauver	Sparkman
Dworshak	Kennedy	Stennis
Eastland	Kerr	Symington
Ellender	Kilgore	Thye
Ferguson	Knowland	Watkins
Frear	Lennon	Welker
Fulbright	Long	Williams
Gore	Magnuson	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on

EMERGENCY FAMINE RELIEF AUTHORITY

JULY 27, 1953.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. HOPE, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 6016]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6016) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Pages 1 and 2, after the word "transfer" in line 8 on page 1, strike out the remainder of section 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations. Not more than \$100,000,000 (including the Corporation's investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all transfers and deliveries under this Act, of which not more than \$20,000,000 shall go to any single country. The President may make such transfer through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate.

Page 2, line 17, strike out the words "June 30, 1955" and insert in lieu thereof "March 15, 1954".

Amend the title so as to read:

A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the United States.

STATEMENT

The purpose of this bill (H. R. 6016) is to authorize the President to use stocks of agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price-support operations to relieve famine or other urgent relief requirements abroad. As amended by the committee, the authority conferred by the bill will terminate on March 15, 1954, is limited to a total assistance of not more than \$100,000,000, and to not more than \$20,000,000 for any one country.

The bill was introduced pursuant to a request from the President for such legislation, which is attached hereto and made a part of this report. As pointed out in the President's message, Congress has several times in recent years been called upon to enact emergency legislation authorizing the President to utilize American agricultural commodities for the relief of famine or other emergency conditions abroad. Particularly in view of the most recent developments in the unsettled world situation, the committee believes that it may be especially helpful for the President to have this advance authority during the next few months when Congress will not be in session. As introduced, the bill did not contain any limitation on the total amount of commodities or funds which could be expended for purposes of this legislation and carried a termination date of June 30, 1955. In his message to the Congress on this subject, however, the President stated that he was requesting the authority "within appropriate limitations" and this position was reiterated by the Assistant Secretary of State who appeared before the committee in favor of the bill.

In one respect, the committee amendment broadens the scope of the bill. As introduced, the bill limited the emergency assistance to "any nation friendly to the United States." The amendment adopted by the committee will permit the President also to utilize the authority of this legislation to extend assistance to "friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations." The objective of the bill is to authorize the President to act in emergency situations to relieve human hunger and misery. The committee believes it is consistent with this objective to provide, as the amendment does, that relief need not be limited to nations officially friendly to the United States but may be extended also to friendly populations of other countries if it can be distributed so as to actually reach them and relieve their distress.

The committee has stipulated clearly in its amendment that the amount of \$100 million which is set as the maximum amount of assistance which may be extended pursuant to the provisions of this bill is to include not only the cost of the commodities involved but also all costs of making transfer and deliveries of those commodities. The same conditions apply to the limitation of \$20 million of such relief for any one country.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD GIVE AUTHORITY TO UTILIZE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES HELD BY THIS GOVERNMENT TO MEET NEEDS ARISING FROM FAMINE OR OTHER URGENT RELIEF REQUIREMENTS

To the Congress of the United States:

Because of the great productivity of our farms, the people of the United States have been able, on several occasions in recent years, to come to the aid of friendly countries faced with famine. In 1951 agricultural supplies were provided to India, and only recently wheat has been made available to the people of Pakistan. In both instances we were able to provide assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements by using stocks of commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. On each of these occasions the Congress has been forced to add consideration of these emergency programs to its very heavy workload. This procedure not only adds to the congressional burden but also slows the speed with which this Government can come to the assistance of a nation urgently needing relief.

I therefore believe it advisable to have general legislation which, within appropriate limitations, would permit the President to meet these situations. The legislation I am requesting would give the President the authority to utilize agricultural commodities held by this Government, but it would limit that authority to meet only the occasional needs arising from famine or other urgent relief requirements.

The objectives of such a program are not to be confused with the principal objective of our mutual security program. The mutual security program aims at promoting the long-range security of the United States by assisting our friends to strengthen their long-range economic and defensive capabilities. The program I am now proposing aims at mitigating the hard blows of unusual and urgent emergencies.

Since we cannot adequately foresee the specific needs to be met under the legislation I am requesting, we cannot now determine the most effective and equitable conditions under which such assistance may be rendered in a particular situation. Consequently, I am requesting authority to establish, when the need arises, the terms and conditions under which these agricultural commodities shall be made available.

In order that there may be a minimum of delay in assisting nations stricken with famine or having other urgent relief requirements, I am requesting that the Commodity Credit Corporation be given authority to make available from its stocks the necessary agricultural commodities to meet these emergency needs. To prevent impairment of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to permit necessary budgetary adjustments, I am recommending an authorization to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation to the extent of its investment in commodities furnished by it, plus any other costs, including interest, which it may incur in carrying out programs authorized under this act. When the costs of any programs carried out under terms of this act can be ascertained, the Congress will be asked to appropriate the necessary funds to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation. I further propose that the authority to undertake programs of famine and other urgent relief assistance under this legislation expire on June 30, 1955.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 30, 1953.



83^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6016

[Report No. 983]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 30, 1953

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 27, 1953

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and
4 directed to make available to the President, out of stocks of
5 agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit
6 Corporation through price support operations, such agricul-
7 tural commodities as may be requested by the President for
8 transfer to ~~any nation friendly to the United States in order~~

1 to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such
2 nation. The President may make such transfer through such
3 agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and condi-
4 tions as he deems appropriate (1) to *any nation friendly to*
5 *the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent*
6 *relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but*
7 *needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their*
8 *government providing that such commodities will be so dis-*
9 *tributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations.*
10 *Not more than \$100,000,000 (including the Corporation's*
11 *investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all trans-*
12 *fers and deliveries under this Act, of which not more than*
13 *\$20,000,000 shall go to any single country. The President*
14 *may make such transfers through such agencies, in such*
15 *manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems*
16 *appropriate.*

17 SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the
18 Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of
19 hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to
20 the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the
21 Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal
22 to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, in-
23 cluding handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making
24 deliveries hereunder. Any assets available to the Com-
25 modity Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such

1 appropriations or payments, for carrying out the purposes
2 of this Act.

3 SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken
4 under the authority of this Act after ~~June 30, 1955~~ *March*
5 *15, 1954.*

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize the
Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural com-
modities owned by it available to the President for the pur-
pose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine
or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the
United States."

[Report No. 983]

A BILL

To authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

By Mr. HOPE

JUNE 30, 1953

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

JULY 27, 1953

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

"The House Committee on Agriculture drew plans today to go into all the principal agricultural regions of the country to hear from farmers at the grass roots what kind of program for Agriculture they want when the present farm law dies at the end of 1954.

"The...group decided to hold hearings in New England and in the Pennsylvania-New Jersey vegetable producing area in August and then in early October strike out from Washington on a six-weeks study that will extend to the Pacific and from the Canadian border to Mexico.

"Rep. ...Hope...said 'we intend to study all phases of the program we now have and any new proposals that promise solutions for the many problems of agriculture...'

Rep. ...Hoeven...was named Chairman of a subcommittee to work out the exact route the committee will travel...and the places and dates..."

The statement indicates that the study will include price supports, foreign-trade expansion, soil conservation, flood prevention, crop insurance, and farm credit.

3. FORESTRY; FAMINE RELIEF; WHEAT AGREEMENT. The Rules Committee reported resolutions for consideration of H. R. 5603, to authorize national banking associations to make loans on forest tracts; H. R. 6016, to make CCC commodities available to the President to meet famine or other urgent relief needs in friendly countries; and S. J. Res. 97, to implement the International Wheat Agreement Act (p. 10400).
14. FUR LOANS; FOREST SURVEY; ANIMAL DISEASES. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 1152, to extend for 5 years authority to make loans to fur farmers (H. Rept. 1013); S. 725, authorizing a survey of Alaska forest resources (H. Rept. 1012); and S. 2055, to authorize control and eradication of scrapie and blue-tongue in sheep and minor outbreaks of other animal disease which may result in larger outbreaks (H. Rept. 1014)(p. 10400).
15. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 5969, the defense appropriation bill for 1954 (H. Rept. 1015)(pp. 10397-8).
16. TAXATION; PAYROLLING. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 6413, to permit the Federal Government to withhold from employees' wages certain municipal taxes (p. 10400).
17. PENALTY MAIL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6281, to abolish free transportation of official Government mail matter, etc. (H. Rept. 1004)(p. 10400).
18. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4854, to authorize Foster Creek division irrigation works, Chief Joseph Dam (H. Rept. 1016)(p. 10400).
19. POSTAL RATES. The "Daily Digest" states (regarding H. R. 6052, the postal-rate increase bill) that Chairman Rees of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee "announced today that action on postal-rate readjustments has been suspended" (p. D795).
20. RUBBER. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5728, to authorize disposal of Government-owned rubber facilities (pp. 10334-7).
21. PROPERTY. Passed without amendment H. R. 6382, to extend until June 30, 1954 the period during which the GSA may conduct negotiated sales of surplus property (p. 10326).

22. IMMIGRATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 6481, to authorize entry of refugees, etc., into this country (pp. 10337-90).
23. CUSTOMS SIMPLIFICATION. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 5877, the customs-simplification bill (pp. 10395-6). This bill will now be sent to the President.
24. LAND TRANSFER. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) S. 2163, to authorize conveyance of certain land in the U. S. cotton field station near Statesville, N. C. The "Daily Digest" states that "This measure will be acted on in lieu of a similar House bill (H. R. 5888) which was passed yesterday, with a request made that said House proceedings be vacated." (p. D794).
25. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the House will act on the conference report on the defense department appropriation bill; and will probably also consider H. R. 6016, the famine-relief bill, and S. J. Res. 97, to implement the International Wheat Agreement (p. D794).

BILLS INTRODUCED

26. PROPERTY. H. R. 6574, by Rep. Bennett, Fla., and H. J. Res. 312, by Rep. Campbell, to amend section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to permit the disposal of surplus property to State health departments and to county mosquito control districts; to Committee on Government Operations (p. 10401).
27. VETERANS' BENEFITS. H. R. 6582, by Rep. Ayres, to liberalize the direct home loan program under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, in behalf of certain disabled veterans; to Veterans' Affairs Committee (p. 10401).
28. PERSONNEL. H. R. 6583, by Rep. Hagen, Minn., and H. R. 6589, by Rep. Patten, to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 10401).
29. RETIREMENT. H. R. 6588, by Rep. Mack, Wash., to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to farmers and to broaden the coverage of such system in the case of agricultural laborers; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 10401).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

30. FAMINE RELIEF. Sen. Langer inserted a statement by John Baker, National Farmers Union, before the S. Agriculture and Forestry Committee, in favor of the famine relief bill, and urging a careful study of the various plans put forward for use of surplus agricultural products (p. A4957).
31. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Angell inserted a debate appearing in the Sunday Portland Journal on the question of who should build the Hells Canyon Dam (pp. A4958-60).
Rep. Price inserted a Progressive article entitled "Eisenhower Betrays the TVA" (pp. A4969-70).
32. PROPERTY SEIZURE. Extension of remarks by Rep. Celler opposing S. J. Res. 3, proposing a constitutional amendment prohibiting the President from taking private property at any time other than in the manner prescribed by statute law (p. A4961).

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 6016

JULY 28, 1953.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 359]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 359, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



House Calendar No. 131

83^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 359

[Report No. 1007]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JULY 28, 1953

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution
2 it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself
3 into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of
4 the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6016)
5 to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make
6 agricultural commodities owned by it available to the Presi-
7 dent for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in
8 meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in
9 countries friendly to the United States. After general de-
10 bate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue
11 not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled
12 by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Com-

1 mittee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amend-
2 ment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to
3 consider without the intervention of any point of order
4 the amendments recommended by the Committee on Agri-
5 culture now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the
6 consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee
7 shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amend-
8 ments as may have been adopted, and the previous question
9 shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments
10 thereto to final passage without intervening motion except
11 one motion to recommit.

83d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 359

[Report No. 1007]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 6016,
a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit
Corporation to make agricultural commodi-
ties owned by it available to the President
for the purpose of enabling the President to
assist in meeting famine or other urgent re-
lief requirements in countries friendly to the
United States.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois

JULY 28, 1953

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
printed

7/29/53

-4-

34. RECLAMATION. S. 2521, by Sen. Kuchel, to authorize the Interior Department to construct, etc., the Santa Margarita project, Calif.; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 10695).
35. RECREATION. H. R. 6607, by Rep. Howell, to establish a Federal Recreation Service in the NEW Department; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 10650).

HOUSE (Continued)

36. FAMINE RELIEF. Passed with amendments S. 2249, to authorize CCC to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the U. S. (pp. 10597-622). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Weichel providing that at least 50% of the commodities be shipped in American ships (pp. 10609-10). Rejected an amendment by Rep. Jones to reduce the authorization by 50 million (pp. 10607-8), and an amendment by Rep. Coudert to delete language providing for repayment to CCC of its investment in surplus commodities to be used (pp. 10613-14). The following language was stricken on a point of order raised by Rep. Jones, Mo.: "Any assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used in advance of such appropriations or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this act" (p. 10613). ITEMS IN APPENDIX
37. WATER RESOURCES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Johnson, Tex., claiming the real key to continued industrial development of the Southwest lies in greater utilization of the potential water supply (p. A5031).
38. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Goldwater inserted an American Agriculturist editorial criticizing price supports (p. A5032).
39. IMPORT CONTROLS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Golden urging additional import control by the executive branch (pp. A5042-3).
Rep. Smith, Miss., inserted a Reporter magazine article opposing high tariffs (pp. A5052-3).
40. DROUGHT SITUATION. Sen. Johnson, Tex., inserted a newspaper article describing the drought situation (pp. A5053-4).
41. EXPENDITURES. Rep. Coudert inserted Rep. Hoffman's statement favoring H. R. 2, to limit Federal expenditures to receipts (p. A5047).
42. BANKING AND CURRENCY. Rep. Horan inserted a newspaper editorial favoring return to the gold standard (p. A5033).

COMMITTEE HEARINGS RELEASED BY G. P. O.

43. FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954, H. R. 6391. S. Appropriations Committee.

-O-

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105A.

-O-

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENT FOR JULY 30: Loans on forest tracts, S. Banking and Currency (exec).

21. WEATHER CONTROL. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendment S. 285, to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification (H. Rept. 1022)(p. 10649).
22. SUBMERGED LANDS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5134, providing for U. S. jurisdiction over submerged lands in the outer continental shelf, which had been reported from conference earlier in the day (H. Rept. 1031)(pp. 10650, 10630-4).
23. FORESTRY. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 4646, to provide for transfer of Government timber lands to private operators of sustained-yield projects which are taken over for Government projects (p. 10634).
24. FOREIGN TRADE. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2763, to reduce the duty on the importation of wood dowels, if made of fir, spruce, hemlock, or larch, and to provide for duty-free importation of unfinished wood dowels (H. Rept. 1044)(p. 10650).
25. MINERALS; PUBLIC LANDS. Received the conference report on S. 2220, to provide certain exemptions from the requirements that pipelines having rights-of-way over public lands must be operated as common carriers (H. Rept. 1032)(pp. 10634-5).
26. DROUGHT-RELIEF APPROPRIATION. Concurred in the Senate amendment to H. J. Res. 305, drought-relief appropriation bill (p. 10555). This bill will now be sent to the President.
27. PENALTY MAIL. Passed as reported H. R. 6281, requiring all Government departments, agencies, etc., to reimburse the Post Office Department in amounts equivalent to the amount of postage on their penalty mail (pp. 19565-6).
28. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Marshall commended the House Agriculture Committee for planning to hold hearings throughout the country on farm problems after Congress adjourns, favored attendance at these hearings by USDA officials, criticized recent CCC operations as "confidence-shaking," and asked for an adequate farm program (pp. 10640-1).
29. PERSONNEL. Rep. Rogers, Mass., opposed several bills on veterans' benefits, including H. R. 6185, requiring disabled veterans to acquire a passing civil-service grade before adding the preference points (pp. 10645-7).
30. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The Majority Leader announced that the Consent and Private Calendars will be considered today, July 30.(p. 10566).

BILLS INTRODUCED

31. PENALTY MAIL. S. 2502, by Sen. Frear, to provide for reimbursement of the Post Office Department for penalty mail; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Also S. 2503. (p. 10483.)
32. PROPERTY. S. 2505, by Sen. McCarthy, to amend the GSA Act; to Government Operations Committee (p. 10486).
33. BANKING AND CURRENCY. S. 2514, by Sen. McCarran, to establish a sound monetary system, etc.; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 10488). Remarks of author (pp. 10488-90).

of Public Law 534, 82d Congress, to proceed with public works projects as is represented by the following amounts with respect to the following installations is rescinded:

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: \$17,000,000.

Houma Guntery Range, Houma, La.: \$3,000,000.

Charlotte County Airport, Punta Gorda, Fla.: \$2,731,000.

Godman Air Force Base, Fort Knox, Ky.: \$995,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. SHORT the proceedings whereby the bill, H. R. 6545, was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD immediately following the last recorded vote today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY FAMINE RELIEF AUTHORITY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 359 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6016) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which the Clerk has just read makes in order the consideration of H. R. 6016, which has for its purpose the providing of food for starving peoples.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, and I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 359, makes in order a bill reported by the Committee

on Agriculture. I have no requests for time on the rule on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6016) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6016, with Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is entitled to 30 minutes, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is entitled to 30 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this bill was introduced in the House and considered in the Committee on Agriculture as a result of a message which came from the President of the United States on June 30, asking that the Congress authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make available the agricultural commodities owned by the Corporation to be used in relieving famine and distress in other parts of the world. The measure as originally introduced did not contain any limitations. I introduced the bill and purposely introduced it that way because the President's message stated that the legislation along this line was desired with such limitations as Congress cared to place upon the authority. I did not feel that I was justified in saying what those limitations should be. I simply introduced the legislation granting the authority and left it to the Committee on Agriculture to determine what the limitations it felt should be imposed.

The bill which we now have before us is quite similar to the bill which passed the Senate unanimously on Monday of this week. It provides that the President may transfer the commodities made available by the Commodity Credit Corporation to any nation friendly to the United States for the purpose of meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements; and, further—and this is an amendment that the committee placed in the bill—to make those commodities available to friendly but needy popula-

tions without regard to the friendliness of their government, provided that such commodities would be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among populations. That, of course, was intended to deal with a situation such as we have in East Germany today. The overall limitation which is placed in the bill is that the stocks so turned over shall not exceed \$100 million, and the intention is that that \$100 million will also include the cost of transporting these commodities.

There is a further provision and this is the only respect in which the House bill differs from the Senate bill, that not more than \$20 million worth of these commodities shall go to any one country.

Those are the principal provisions of the bill. They constitute the authority which is given to the President of the United States to deal with such emergency situations as may arise during the time when Congress is not in session.

Under the terms of the bill the authority expires on March 15, 1954. I would say that if Congress were in session and in a position to deal with these matters there would not be as great necessity for this legislation as there is otherwise; but I believe that every Member of Congress will agree with me that during the past few years on many occasions our country has been placed at a disadvantage with Communist Russia because in situations where there was an opportunity to relieve distress and to furnish food supplies to hungry people the Communist Government could act promptly. This was by reason of the fact that it had absolute authority and could move in with no delay and get credit for doing something that in many cases did not amount to anything but which looked like something worth while at the time when viewed in the light of Communist propaganda. We did far more but in most cases got no credit because our Government was not in a position to act in a timely way. I do not believe that is a situation that any of us wants to see continue, especially during these times when no one knows what is going to happen in world affairs in the next few months. We know that things are likely to move fast.

If we are to make use of this great store of commodities which a divine providence has given to this Nation, then we should put the authority in the hands of the President so he can handle the matter in such a way as to bring about the best results and deal with the situation in the most prompt manner possible. We have these commodities, over \$3 billion worth of them. They are a part of the farm-price support program of this country. I am in favor of that program, it has been working well in most particulars, but I do not know of anything which will do greater harm to the price support program or bring it into disrepute any more rapidly than to have commodities which the Commodity Credit Corporation is holding in storage spoil while there are hungry and starving people in various parts of the world.

I want to appeal to the House to support this bill for reasons of humanity, and upon the basis of making the best

use possible of these blessings which divine providence has given this great Nation.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I ask whether it would be a fatal defect in the bill if an amendment were adopted which I have prepared striking out the phrase "of which not more than \$20 million shall go to any single country"? My reason is this: Congress is going out of session shortly; we are leaving this emergency program largely to the discretion of the President anyhow, so why would it not be advisable to give the President full discretion under the policies outlined by Congress, as my amendment would do?

Mr. HOPE. I certainly would not want to say that the adoption of that amendment would be a fatal defect in the bill. It is up to the House to determine whether or not it wishes to keep that limitation. In committee we felt that was a proper limitation. I am not wedded to the idea of any particular amount. The committee put the amendment in, and, as far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to have the House work its will on the matter and place the limitation at a higher level or take it out, whatever the House wants to do.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Was not the committee advised that other funds were available to the same amount through the Mutual Security Administration?

Mr. HOPE. The committee was given to understand, and I am sure it is correct, that there are funds which are contained in last year's mutual security appropriations consisting of \$100 million which the President has under his control to use as he sees fit. I do not think originally it was intended that they were to be used to furnish food supplies. But they have been used, as I understand, in connection with the food we are sending into East Germany.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. It is true that a little over a year ago when the Mutual Security Act was extended there was an amendment put in by our then colleague from Connecticut, Mr. Ribicoff, and myself, to provide \$100 million to be used at the discretion of the President, not only for friendly countries, but in other situations outside of the general scope of the Mutual Security Act when he determined it to be important to the security of the United States. That authority was made even broader in the Mutual Security Act recently enacted. He has had \$100 million all this last year and has used \$15 million of it in the last few weeks for aid to East Berlin. So, with the money in this bill the President will have at his disposal \$185 million which certainly is all he conceivably will need before January for "the occasional needs

arising from famine or other unusual and urgent emergencies" to quote the President's words.

I subscribe to the gentleman's views that on matters of this sort Congress should not appropriate blank checks for larger amounts than there is any reasonable probability of needing.

Mr. HOPE. Yes. I understand that in the amendment which the gentleman is the author of there was a limitation of \$20 million.

Mr. JUDD. That is right; a total of \$100 million, with not more than \$20 million to any one country.

Mr. HOPE. The same limitation as in this bill.

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. My amendment, of course, would still leave in the \$20 million money limitation in the Mutual Security Act to each separate country but would take the limitation off the food. As everybody knows the place where the bulk of the food is most likely to go is East Germany and East Berlin.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. Because I have heard the point raised that this is a dumping program by which great quantities of Commodity Credit Corporation products will be shipped abroad, I think it is wise to point out that the ceiling on the total amount involved in this bill by comparison with the total amount held involves probably not to exceed 3 percent.

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is correct, and I appreciate the gentleman calling that point to the attention of the Committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has said that this is a humanitarian project.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. If you want to pitch it upon that basis, there are plenty of hungry people in this country. As a matter of fact, you can walk about 3 blocks from the New House Office Building and find people who do not get 3 square meals a day.

Mr. HOPE. Well, we are dealing with a different situation.

Mr. GROSS. I hope you will keep the emotional play out of this thing, because there are people in this country who are hungry, too, that have a better claim to be taken care of out of surplus products if they are to be handed out on this basis.

Mr. HOPE. I hope we will not bring the emotional element in, and if the gentleman will stay out of it, I will.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. This bill is actually a bill appropriating \$100 million, is it not?

Mr. HOPE. It authorizes an appropriation to reimburse the Commodity

Credit Corporation for whatever amounts are used of its surplus up to \$100 million.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is, of course, supplementing the foreign aid program. My interest in it is simply this: Why was this not taken out of the Mutual Security fund? I mean, was it considered by the committee at the time the bill was considered?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, that matter was considered by the committee and, the committee felt that as far as the Mutual Security fund was concerned, that the Congress had dealt with that subject. That is a matter that comes from another committee. Our committee has no jurisdiction over it, and my understanding is that the funds appropriated for Mutual Security have all been allocated for certain purposes, so that if we should take those funds we would, of course, be taking them away from some other purpose for which they were allocated by the committee and the House.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I note these foodstuffs will be sent to the friendly nations.

Mr. HOPE. That is one phase of it. We provide for sending them to friendly nations, and also to friendly people in nations whose governments are unfriendly.

Mr. JENSEN. That is what I wanted to ask about. Just what does the gentleman mean by "friendly people"? Would you send them to organizations that are approved by the nations?

Mr. HOPE. The situation in East Germany is a perfect illustration of what we mean by "friendly people." We are supplying food to East Germany. It has been sent to other countries through the offices of organizations like CARE. CARE has arrangements with a number of countries, I believe, whereby it has supplied commodities, some of which have been secured from the Commodity Credit Corporation. That would be one method you could use, I think, to get these supplies into unfriendly countries or rather countries with unfriendly governments.

Mr. JENSEN. I have been concerned considerably like many other people, about the fact that the good services of the Red Cross have not been used to the fullest extent that they should be used in the distribution of these foodstuffs. The Red Cross is operating over there. Does the gentleman suppose the Red Cross will be used as well as CARE?

Mr. HOPE. I can only say it could be used under the provisions of this bill. Any responsible voluntary agency could be used. I am sure that if the situation warrants it, it will be used.

Mr. JENSEN. I want the gentleman to know I am in perfect harmony with the purposes of the bill.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to have that assurance from the gentleman. I am sure when the bill becomes a law and is being administered, consideration will be given to the views he has expressed.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the discussion yesterday in the Rules Committee with respect to this bill, and I wanted to ask some questions and wanted to use some time on the rule to discuss briefly my thoughts about it. Others probably wanted to use time under the rule. The rule was called up without notice to me or to any Member of the minority on the Rules Committee. That has happened rather frequently in the last few days. In common courtesy, it seems to me, the majority leadership could notify minority members of the Rules Committee at the same time they notify the majority members of the Rules Committee to be present for these rules.

I do not want to be disagreeable about it, but I have complained about it frequently. Twice today while the Rules Committee has been in session, and while it has been desirable for the minority Members to be present, rules have been called up without notice enough for us to get here in time to claim the time of the minority on these rules.

As I say, I have protested and I have requested that we be notified. I do not want to do anything drastic about it, but unless we are notified I think it will be necessary for someone on the minority side of the House to demand a quorum in each instance when a rule is called up. We certainly do not want to have to resort to that sort of thing. That would consume a lot of time. I hope that somebody in responsible leadership on the other side will see that this situation is corrected. I am sure it is just a matter of inadvertence, but it has happened too often, and we must see that it does not happen any more.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The same thing applies to the minority on the House Committee on Agriculture. I was given notice that the bill was going to be called up at this time, and I do not suppose any other member of the minority was notified that the bill would be considered at this time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The Committee on Agriculture met this morning. Almost all the members were there. It was announced in the committee that the bill would come up today. I think practically every member of the committee knows that. If the gentleman was not advised, I am sorry.

Mr. COOLEY. I am sure the gentleman did not mean to be discourteous, but this is a rather busy and long day. I wish we could have had at least an hour's notice that the bill would be considered. Fortunately, I was here.

Mr. HOPE. I regret that the gentleman did not know, but certainly a large majority of the Members on his side did know when the announcement was made.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, may I inform the gentleman from Virginia that we do give notice to the minority every time a bill is to be brought up. At the beginning of the day, a list of those bills which are likely to come up are given to the Members of the minority. Of course, in these last busy days of the session, when the House is trying to adjourn, the Members of the minority have some responsibility to be here so that they need not be sent for.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Speaker has been a member and a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, and he knows that in the last days of the session, the Committee on Rules is in almost constant session. We have been in our committee all day today, and it is known by all that we are there. We are trying to facilitate the business of the House, and all we are asking is the courtesy to be notified in time enough so that we can walk from upstairs to downstairs before you call up a rule. I know it is just an inadvertence. I am not quarreling about anything except that it is an inadvertence. But somehow or other, it seems to me that members of the Committee on Rules on the majority side always get here to call up a rule, and it would seem to me just as easy to also notify someone on our side. I am sure, as I said before, it is simply an inadvertence.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, it is an inadvertence that he, personally, was not notified, and we shall see that he is notified as well as the Committee on Rules before other rules are called up.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. Chairman, do I have any time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is not enough to do me any good.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield back 30 seconds?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; I do not yield back the time. I just wanted to talk a little about this bill and certain features of it, but 30 seconds does not give me the time to do that, so I will not talk about the bill at this time but I will wait until the bill is being read under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

(Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, this bill was approved by our committee by a vote of 14 to 9. In our discussion on the measure it was brought out by the State Department that they now have \$14,500,000,000. We asked them whether or not they would be willing to take this \$100 million out of their appropriation instead of the appropriation of the Department of Agriculture. Of course, they objected to that because it was the additional

\$100 million, which they wanted for their foreign-aid program. Mr. Chairman, this is just a continuation of the Santa Claus program. They were not satisfied with the \$14½ billion. They came to our Committee on Agriculture a few months ago and asked for the \$122 million for Pakistan. They got that in addition to their \$14½ billion. — Once again they were not satisfied so they came back to the Committee on Agriculture. They did not ask us for \$100 million, they asked for \$3 billion. They wanted a blank check on the Commodity Credit Corporation which has \$3 billion of assets. The committee itself cut it down to \$100 million because we felt we should not just give the entire country away. It seems as if the State Department and the internationalists have no consideration for the American people and the taxpayers, but they want to continue to give our assets and hard-earned tax money away. Now they ask for all the food we had in the Commodity Credit Corporation. Mr. Chairman, this is the Brannan plan not for the consumers of the United States but the Brannan plan in global affairs. They are asking us today to give this \$100 million in food under the Brannan plan to foreign countries. The Brannan plan which we defeated and rejected in the Committee on Agriculture some 2 years ago, proposed that the Congress would appropriate money and give it to the farmers and by subsidizing the farmers the consumer would have low-cost food.

Instead of giving them the Brannan plan, we adopted a good farm program. Now the State Department comes in and says, "We did not get the Brannan plan for the consumers of the United States, so let us have it for the world, and exclude the United States." That is what this is, and it costs the taxpayers \$100 million. The farmers have been paid their subsidies, the foreign nations get the food and we get nothing in return except hatred. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] asked a while ago who was entitled to receive under this bill. I wish the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture were printed so you could read them and see Mr. Waugh's testimony. Any country is entitled to receive these benefits that the President specifies, because we are technically not at war with anyone. So the President could include Communist Russia. He could specify Communist China, North Korea or any country that he wants, because technically we are not at war. So, as a result, I fear part of this will go to your Communist enemies. There is no doubt about it, in my mind, from the testimony of Mr. Waugh, that some of these benefits will go behind the Iron Curtain.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, this is a continuation of the Truman Santa Claus program which the leadership of the Republican administration has adopted, and are now even surpassing Truman. I will continue to oppose this giveaway program because I am interested in the fulfillment of the promises that you people made during the last campaign as well as in balancing the budget and reducing taxes. If you

continue this giveaway program, we cannot possibly balance the budget. Such actions are not in accord with the clear mandate we received from the taxpayers and voters. It has been well said that "A promise made, is a debt unpaid." We must remember the promise that you are not fulfilling, because you are spending more today than Harry Truman ever spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

(Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have reached a point in Congress where we cannot appropriate money fast enough on specific bills for foreign relief. Just recently we passed a bill to give away wheat to Pakistan. We are confronted now with the proposition that within the next day or two, or shortly, we will be asked to appropriate \$200 million as a beginning of foreign aid to Korea. We have appropriated approximately \$4,438,000,000 in foreign aid already in the House this year, in addition to the unobligated carryover amount of \$1,758,000,000 brought over from last year.

Now, this is a proposal to just give a blank check for \$100 million, and nobody in the House now knows where it will finally wind up. I say nobody knows. I do not know. I think a great majority of the membership of this House does not know. We simply know that we do not have the time to take up individually the cases of needy countries, none of whom specifically have as yet made application to us for any such program as this. But just so that we will not miss any opportunity to scatter American goods around the world, we must here and now, in the last days of the session, give a blank check for \$100 million, just on the possibility that somebody will come along with hat in hand and say, "You have left me out. I want you to give me some now, while the giving is good."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, all that this bill does is to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to turn over its commodities to the President in the amount of not more than \$100 million. The Commodity Credit Corporation has a great many of these commodities which if something is not done will spoil sooner or later. Does the gentleman think we ought to let them spoil or that it would be better to give them to hungry people who could consume them?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. In the first place I have not heard of any hungry people asking for them. In the second place this is going to call for the spending of \$100 million, and it is going to come out of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I might say to my good friend and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that in testimony before our committee we asked Mr. Wall what he would take out of Commodity Credit. He said he did not know. So there is no assurance whatsoever that he will take those items which are about to spoil, because you and I both know that he is going to take those basic commodities which are not losing any money at all.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. As far as that goes there are some that are already too badly spoiled to be used, and this bill is not going to help that situation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is complaining because this bill authorizes an appropriation to compensate the Commodity Credit Corporation for the value of the goods which are taken. Does not the gentleman think the Commodity Credit Corporation capital should be kept unimpaired so it can be used to carry out the farm program of the country?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Certainly I am complaining. This bill authorizes the appropriation of \$100 million. The time has come in this country when somebody ought to balance appropriations with income. I just heard over the radio this morning that the President is going to call on Congress before we adjourn to increase the debt limit from \$275 billions to some ceiling not yet known. It is this sort of thing that keeps the national debt of this country increasing. I do not know whether we will have to go to \$300 billion or higher.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to respond to the statement of the chairman of the committee. We are all aware that the Secretary of Agriculture has made great claims for a new program he has developed for handling the Commodity Credit Corporation; that is, that they are turning over those commodities and getting out into the channels of trade those they have had on hand for some time and replacing them with new commodities. It is an innovation and certainly one we hope will work out. I do not see why, necessarily, they should hold things until they spoil.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

(Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I think we have a very practical piece of legislation before us. If we are interested in preserving the price-support program it is highly essential that we give immediate attention to the surplus problem. We have heard comment to the effect that the President would use only the basic commodities and forget all about the perishable commodities. As far as I am concerned the President should be requested to use Commodity Credit stocks which are of a perishable nature.

The Commodity-Credit program has been brought into disrepute on account of the potato fiasco. We have the butter problem now. I think it is to the interest of agriculture to dispose of these commodities which are in surplus, especially when they are of a perishable nature. If there is anything that is going to destroy the farm program of this country it is the building up of large surpluses and permitting them to spoil. I think we can support this bill not only on a humanitarian basis but also on another basis. I am not one of those who subscribes to the idea that this is an entirely humanitarian proposal. We are really killing 2 birds with 1 stone. Not only are we being humanitarian, in feeding the hungry, but we are also getting rid of some of our surplus commodities. That is the very thing we should be doing in view of the large surpluses we have on hand.

When the bill was originally proposed the sky was the limit. There were no limitations as to the amounts which could be expended. So I hope you will give the Committee on Agriculture some credit for placing some limitation on the legislation.

In the original bill there was no limitation on the amount to be expended. The President could have dissipated and used the entire \$3 billion stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation at his discretion. The committee placed the \$100 million limitation on the amount of CCC stocks which could be used and also placed a limitation date on the legislation, to wit, March 15, 1954. In committee I proposed the \$20 million limitation on the amount to be given to any particular country. I know of no reason why there should not be such a limitation as far as transfers to any particular country are concerned. Without the limitation I can well conceive of the entire \$100 million being given to a single country.

Assume, for instance, that the full \$100 million was given to Yugoslavia, a friendly nation. We have aided Tito before, and perhaps we may want to help him again. If we gave the entire \$100 million to Yugoslavia, what would the people of Italy think about that? Press reports on yesterday indicated that the De Gasperi government in Italy fell because the United States had been too friendly with Tito. So it was very proper, in my opinion, to put a limitation in the bill providing that only \$20 million can be given to any particular country.

Assume, again, that we gave the full \$100 million to East Germany, how would the people of Poland feel about that, or any of the other countries behind the Iron Curtain? In my judgment, it would help our friendly relations with other countries if we would not prefer one friendly country to another.

The \$20 million limitation is one-fifth of \$100 million, so we could at least help out 5 friendly nations, whereas if we gave the whole \$100 million to 1 country we would just create a lot of enemies on the part of those who received nothing.

So we should approach this problem in a very realistic way. We should dis-

tribute these surplus commodities among the friendly nations as best we can and not give them all to one country. Why invite a lot of criticism and thereby disturb our friendly relations with other nations.

This bill is not only in the interest of feeding hungry people but affords an avenue of disposing of surplus commodities in an orderly way.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman for a very realistic, a very worthwhile speech. After all, if we do not do something with these surplus commodities we may pay for such inaction in the future by many times this amount in loss of our price-support program.

Mr. HOEVEN. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. I am trying to get away from the criticism that has been directed at the Commodity Credit Corporation on account of the potato situation and the butter situation.

I wonder what the opponents of this bill want to do. Do they want these stocks to deteriorate and spoil and invite more criticism of the Commodity Credit Corporation? I dare say the consumers of this country would soon demand that we do away with the entire program. That is the thing we want to avoid.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LOVRE. With reference to the limitation placed in this bill, is it not true that the limitation also applies to the cost of handling, including packaging and freight, so the total liability in this particular case could not exceed in any event \$100 million for everything?

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman is correct. The committee was very much concerned about transportation costs. The gentleman from South Dakota was quite instrumental in having the protective provision incorporated in the bill so that transportation costs could be included.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has indicated that this would solve the perishable commodity problem, is that correct?

Mr. HOEVEN. That it would solve the problem of perishables?

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes.

Mr. HOEVEN. I made no such statement. I only expressed the hope that some of the perishable commodities would be used in the disposal of the surplus stocks.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not a fact that the appeal for this program was not made in the interest of solving the so-called surplus problem, but just simply to relieve famine around the world?

Mr. HOEVEN. That may be the major purpose, but I have already indicated that I was one of those who did not

subscribe to that theory alone. In actual practice we are not only being humanitarian but we are also disposing of some of our surplus products, and I think that is the thing to do.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Some people seem to think that there is something wrong if, when we do something which our heart dictates as good for other people, it is also good for ourselves. Rather we should be thankful that we have these surpluses which it is in our own interest as well as the interest of needy people to use for this exceedingly worthwhile purpose. The gentleman is right in denying the implication that we are doing this to dump surpluses. We are doing what is right for needy people, and as what is right usually does, it helps solve one of our toughest problems here at home.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentleman for his helpful observation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

(Mr. WHEELER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, it seems that almost every difficulty that the new administration finds itself faced with, excuse is made on the ground that it is caused by some program that was left in its lap, so to speak, by the previous administration. I would like to suggest that that claim cannot be made with reference to this particular problem because the so-called Brannan plan was never adopted by the last administration even to apply to this country, to say nothing of making it apply on an international scale.

Now, insofar as the disposition of these surplus commodities is concerned, I will be willing to support your proposition if you will be honest enough about it to charge these funds to the Mutual Security Administration. You have told the American people repeatedly for the last few weeks that you have accomplished a great deal in the way of economy by reducing the proposed Mutual Security program that was presented by the last administration in the way of a budget. You have not done any such thing if you will total all the moneys that have been authorized and appropriated, come the end of this Congress. Just last week we appropriated close to \$5 billion for foreign aid. We had just appropriated, or authorized to be appropriated, \$125 million, approximately, to furnish Pakistan with wheat and to pay the freight. Now you come in with another \$100 million. The fact of the business is I am impressed with the fact that you cannot possibly keep your Committee on Foreign Affairs in session sufficiently long hours to raid the Treasury to your own satisfaction, therefore you spread the onerous task around. You want us on the Committee of Agriculture to perform part of that task. Now, as I say, I will support the move to give to foreign hungry people

surplus commodities if you will charge it to the foreign aid program.

I do take exception to one proviso in this legislation which does not draw the line as between friendly and unfriendly people. I cannot for the life of me see the point in sacrificing 140 or 150 thousand casualties in Korea, supposedly fighting communism, and then coming in here with an authorization to feed enemy and friend alike. I cannot, I repeat, justify to my conscience a move which would feed my enemies after they have killed my brothers. That is exactly what this bill proposes to do. It says friendly and unfriendly peoples alike.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. According to the testimony before our committee, we have no enemies, technically speaking.

Mr. WHEELER. One other angle to this measure I should like to comment on very briefly, and that is that this is another move to give the Executive additional authority. We in the Congress have become so busy with our own concerns or have become so spineless that we will no longer face up to our responsibilities. Here again you are adopting lock, stock, and barrel the approach that was adopted by the administrations over the past 20 years. The Congress said, "We cannot be bothered with these detailed problems. We will authorize the President to do as he pleases, and we will appropriate to him a few billion dollars to implement whatever moves he cares to make in this field."

An amendment will be offered when we start reading this bill, perhaps, to charge this program to the Mutual Security Administration. If that amendment is adopted, I shall support the bill for purely selfish reasons, and that is as a means of dumping some surplus commodities.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I do not have much time, but I would like to make three points briefly.

First, it has been suggested that this bill came from the administration in the form of a blank check against all the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and that is true, but that is not the proposition before the House now. The committee has agreed upon a bill with three specific limitations: First, a total amount of \$100 million; second, a limit of \$20 million to any one country; and, third, a termination date of March 15, 1954. That is the proposition before us now.

In the second place, it has been suggested that this program should be charged to the mutual-security program and not to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I would have no objection to that. I would like to point out, however, that the warehouses of the Commodity Credit Corporation are filled with the products of American farms. All the commodities in these inventories are subject to deterioration, some more so

than others. Nothing could happen to the farm program that would be more disastrous than to see those commodities spoil while people friendly to the United States were starving anywhere in the world. Nothing would do more to bring down on our heads the scorn of friendly people or the contempt of our people at home.

We talk about charging this to the Mutual Security Administration. The fact is that agriculture, like every other industry, is willing to assume its share of the responsibility for the policies of this country. It is true that the farm program has made money. It is also true that we had huge stocks of inventories at the opening of World War II, and we are glad we did. Agriculture contributed its share to the winning of World War II by those stocks. So I do not take a lot of stock in this question of whether we should charge this to the Commodity Credit Corporation or to the Mutual Security Administration.

It has been said that this can be made available to friendly and unfriendly people alike. No such provision is in this bill. These commodities can be made available to friendly countries and to friendly peoples even though their governments are unfriendly. I think it should be clear that this program is for people friendly to the United States regardless of the friendliness of their governments. It is not available to people who are not friendly to us.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The gentleman has made a very correct and proper statement. Is it not true that regardless of your bookkeeping entries, the money involved still comes out of the taxpayers' pockets?

Mr. ALBERT. That is right. I agree with the gentleman.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, this is "the Benson plan." When the administration sent up the proposal, the bill drafted in the Budget Bureau contemplated a complete delivery of the entire stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation, valued at \$3 billion, to the President of the United States to deal with as he might deem appropriate. If Charlie Brannan had suggested such a proposal when he was in office, he probably would have been drawn and quartered or otherwise disposed of. This is the trade instead of aid bill. We trade with other nations by giving away our surplus commodities. It is the Benson plan because the State Department refused to pick up the check. MSA refused to pick up the check, and, after shopping around, the present administration prevailed upon Mr. Benson to take the check, and to pay for these commodities, ship them across the seas, pay the railroad freight from the storage warehouses in this country to shipside in the port cities, pay the ocean freight, and pay the freight for distribution in foreign countries, and make house-to-

house deliveries if it should be deemed appropriate. It is only \$100 million. So we won a great victory in the committee when the committee repudiated the President's demand and request by 97 percent—the difference between \$3 billion and \$100 million. Here we should repudiate that other 3 percent, because I think this is a vicious back-door raid on the inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Did you in the hearings anywhere get information as to how much of this \$100 million would be stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation and how much would be involved in the distribution cost?

Mr. COOLEY. No such information was supplied to us at all.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. What does the gentleman intend to do with the supplies and inventories in the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not intend for those supplies to imperil the success of the farm program, and if we are going to build up surpluses merely in order to give them away, how long do you think the American taxpayers are going to stand for a program like that?

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. What does the gentleman think is happening to these supplies now?

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman think that if these surpluses spoil that the program will work better?

Mr. COOLEY. If we are simply going to build up surpluses to give them away, the American taxpayers are not going to stand for a program like that. That program contemplates an acreage reduction which will keep production in line with consumer demand. I am not willing to give these surpluses away, but I am willing to sell them in regular trade channels.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is talking about surpluses that already exist, and which, if we do not do something about them, will eventually spoil. I want to say to the gentleman that if he wants to destroy the farm program, then let these surpluses spoil and that is something that the people will not stand for.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say to the gentleman that our committee did not advise Mr. Benson to support dairy products at 90 percent of parity and have butter running out of his ears. He could have lowered that price. He has been inconsistent from the time that he went into office until the present time. Just let me emphasize this point. The President asked for all of the \$3 billion, and his own majority in the House committee would only give him \$100 million. Do you not know that the \$100 million is just putting the camel's nose under the tent, and the next thing it will be \$200 million more for Korea? Yes; this is foreign aid, but, for the psychological

effect it would have on the American public, they come out and brag about having reduced foreign aid. The Pakistan bill was for \$100 million. This bill is for \$100 million. We were told, and I want to emphasize this point—we were told that there was not a place on earth where this money could be used today—there is not one place anywhere where famine or an undue relief situation existed.

Then we said, "What is the urgency about it? Why should we pass this bill if there is no place on earth where the money could be used?" And there was emphasized the further point that the President now has \$85 million to play with in this fashion.

I did not object to MSA. I know that all of you know that I have voted for foreign aid, world without end, year in and year out. I say frankly that had this \$100-million item been a part of the MSA bill, I would not have voted against MSA, and, if the President and the Foreign Affairs Committee felt that they needed \$200 million or \$500 million more, I would have been inclined to go along with them, but I do not want these inventories dissipated in this fashion.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. A good deal has been said about the surplus commodities, and particularly the perishable commodities. I think it should be emphasized that this will not even begin to solve that problem. It will only result, in my opinion—and I think the gentleman will agree—with further condemnation being brought down upon the farm people of this country. That is all it is going to do.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is exactly right. If we start out to encourage the building up of great surpluses only to come along and give them away—of course we can give them away; but think, you people from the business districts, what the President's request would have meant to the regular trade operations in this country. It would have completely destroyed all legitimate trade channels. How could any trader have sold cotton or tobacco or wheat or any of these commodities abroad in any foreign market when the recipient country was conscious of the fact that the President of the United States had \$3 billion worth of such commodities to give away, and all they had to do was to go to him and make an appropriate showing?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. How could that happen under this bill? This applies to countries where famine prevails. If the people have money to buy these commodities, then they will buy them. This applies only to where they do not have the money to buy them. How could that affect legitimate trade channels?

Mr. COOLEY. It is not only famine, but urgent relief requirements. We have made no such provision for American citizens. There is no fund that the

President can turn to to take care of hardships in West Virginia or North Carolina, or California or Waco, Tex., or anywhere else. But here we are asked to do this for people who we do not even know are in distress.

This is just the down payment on the Benson plan. Other demands will follow and other raids on CCC inventories will be made, and the farm program will be further imperiled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas yields 7 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], to close the general debate.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am amazed, surprised, and considerably disturbed by some of the statements made by my friends on my right who have been the leaders in the Committee on Agriculture during the 12 years that I have served on that committee, and who have led the way to giving away everything, including tobacco. Why they should object to a bill, that is only a drop in the bucket, is a mystery to me. No one has made a statement on the floor of this House that would indicate why they are opposed to this bill as their statements indicate. If they have any reason to be opposed to it, they should have stated it while they had the opportunity to talk.

I want to read first an answer to my friend who makes the accusation that our enemies would get the food.

Here is the letter I want to read:

If H. R. 6016 is enacted, the administration would interpret the term "friendly country" for the purposes of that act to mean any country other than (1) the U. S. S. R., or (2) any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement. In direct answer to Mr. POAGE's question concerning the U. S. S. R., Poland, and Communist China, the Department considers that this interpretation would exclude those countries under present circumstances from participation in any benefits under H. R. 6016.

SAMUEL C. WAUGH,
Assistant Secretary.

Now let me read what the President of the United States said on June 30. Here is what he said in his letter:

The objectives of such a program are not to be confused with the principal objective of our mutual security program. The mutual security program aims at promoting the long-range security of the United States by assisting our friends to strengthen their long-range economic and defensive capabilities. The program I am now proposing aims at mitigating the hard blows of unusual and urgent emergencies.

Since we cannot adequately foresee the specific needs to be met under the legislation I am requesting, we cannot now determine the most effective and equitable conditions under which such assistance may be rendered in a particular situation. Consequently, I am requesting authority to establish, when the need arises, the terms and

conditions under which these agricultural commodities shall be made available.

Much has been said about subsidies and surpluses, but you can no more separate subsidies from surplus than you can separate hot air from cold air; it cannot be done. You can feel the difference, but you cannot see it.

Let me say to my friends on my right who have always supported subsidies—and I have generally gone along with the Agriculture Committee on this because I know in some instances it is necessary, but I want to warn you that if you do not find some successful American way of disposing of the surpluses then it is the end of the subsidy program. The program here proposed is humanitarian in the highest degree. We get a lot of misinformation on this floor about some things, but I want to remind you that in the fiscal year 1952 we gave away for domestic consumption out of the bounty of the good Lord's production in agriculture \$35,187,000.

Let me tell you something else that you do not know: Out of section 32 funds in 1953—now, listen to this—we gave away for domestic relief \$56,695,811. Now, if we could all of a sudden decide that we are not going to dispose of surpluses, then you will come to the end of any kind of subsidy, then you are going to upset and uproot all the work that has been done by our agriculture programs.

One more statement, and I am through. No. 1 is this: This is a temporary bill. To listen to all the dire things that have been said in this Chamber this afternoon one would think that this bill was to last the length of my life or the lifetime of any man present. But the truth of the matter is that it expires on March 15, 1954. Is not that awful. Terrible. It is going to wreck this country, giving away \$100 million. Mr. Chairman, that amounts to only about half as much as you have tied up in linseed oil. Oh, how we let the shadows get into our eyes so that we cannot see. It would be a little more than 10 percent of what we have on corn.

Let us keep our thinking straight on this matter. Here the President of the United States is asking for a little help in order to aid friendly people. That is what we want to see done. In this bill they put in the best language they could. Someone has already quoted it. It states: "for famine or urgent relief," then it says "to friendly needy populations without regard to their government."

The philosophy of the Christian religion built up the divinity of the individual. That is exactly what our President means when he urges sending food to people who have not the ability nor the wherewithal to pay for it.

I am convinced in my own mind that had we given away many of our surpluses in place of trying to sell them we would have created much better feeling towards our country and our way of life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate having expired, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President, out of stocks of agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations, such agricultural commodities as may be requested by the President for transfer to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation. The President may make such transfer through such agencies; in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "transfer", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 2 and insert: "(1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations. Not more than \$100 million (including the Corporation's investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all transfers and deliveries under this act, of which not more than \$20 million shall go to any single country. The President may make such transfers through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is said that when St. Paul went to Athens he found the people worshipping many gods and that they had created temples to all the so-called known gods and finally he found a temple erected to the worship of the unknown God.

In recent weeks I have observed a striking similarity between the travels of St. Paul and the political travels of the present administration. The present administration started out by embarking upon a course that they called "trade not aid." I agreed with this course. I believe most of the American people agreed. I was therefore, surprised to find that the first great landmark on the administration's course seemed to be to give away a hundred odd million dollars to the needy people of Pakistan—and the needy American ship-owners who hauled the grain. The next landmark was the mutual-security program. It provided nearly five billion dollars of aid—remember I said of aid—not of trade—with numerous foreign countries. Just yesterday we heard the message of the President of the United States suggesting that we should provide \$200 million for the needy people of Korea. I think most of us are in full accord with that, but this surely does involve a substantial amount of aid, and just as surely it does not add \$200 million of trade. In fact I am still looking for the trade part of the program.

Now we come to the gift to the unknown gods or to the unknown foreigners. To whom are we proposing to give this \$100 million? For what charit-

able purpose are we setting aside \$100 million other than for the benefit of the American shipowners? The shipowners are the only ones who have so far identified themselves. Most of you had a telegram on your desk yesterday afternoon, and it was sent within 15 minutes after the Rules Committee acted, calling upon you to make sure that at least one-half of any goods shipped under this bill must be shipped in high-cost American ships, and that those costs would be charged to the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture.

As has already been pointed out, all of the other agencies of Government shied away from paying for this program, but the Department of Agriculture rushed out and said: Let us pick up the check, let the farmers be the ones to grant this subsidy to our foreign neighbors.

Oh, yes; it was Charley Brannan who said, "Let us subsidize the American housewife; let us pay a part of the grocery bill of American citizens." This House repudiated the Brannan plan. We said, "Under no circumstances would we want our agricultural program to depend on subsidies." A great majority of my friends on my left said, "These subsidies to the American housewives is not only creeping, but loping socialism." Now we are met with the Benson plan which says, "Let us subsidize the grocery bill of some unknown foreigner in some distant land." Remember, that the testimony of the State Department is to the effect that there is at this time no country where famine exists, except where we have already made special provision for relief. In other words, this is not a relief bill for any known needy people. On the other hand, Mr. Benson has apparently embraced this as an easy solution of the surplus problem, particularly the problem of butter surpluses which he brought on himself. He now suggests: "Let us subsidize the foreign consumer, not our American consumer." I am not urging that you subsidize either. I am merely suggesting the utter inconsistency of the attitude of those who now support the worldwide Benson give-away plan.

If, in fact, this is a relief bill, if it is intended to take care of somebody we know not whom, who is actually in necessities circumstances, then let us be honest about it and call it a relief bill and charge it to relief. But, you say, "We must make a showing that we have cut foreign aid. Today we must make good on our promise to the people that we will stop this foreign aid, so we will charge it to the old farmer, put some more weights on the farmer's back, load him down, and break his back." That is what you are doing, if, in fact, this is a real relief bill.

If, on the other hand, this bill is intended to be an agricultural price-support operation, and not a relief program, then why do we not go abroad and sell these goods for foreign currency? Why do we not take something in trade that these people have? They all have their own currency. We need this currency to pay our bills in those countries. Why

do we not make good on this talk of trade not aid? Have we forgotten all those promises, or do you folks who originated this slogan look on it as campaign oratory which you did not mean? You know and I know that this 300 million pounds of butter that you now have spoiling would be very acceptable to lots of people in this world who would like to buy it if they could buy it with their own currency. If we want to trade, let us do so. We have the opportunity. Let us grasp that opportunity.

If, in fact, this bill is in fact, nothing more than a scheme to get rid of some surplus butter, let us sell the butter; let us trade with our foreign friends and let them pay in their own currency. Let us not make this aid and call it trade.

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are a lot of philosophies floating around here today with reference to this bill. I think that we all have a lot of different ideas about how these surpluses should be handled. I have asked some questions but I have received no satisfactory answers. It was not answered during the hearings in the committee. That is on the question of the amount of money involved in the \$100 million which is authorized which would cover the cost of the commodity stocks and that which would be brought about through the transfer and transportation of those products. I also have a question to ask with respect to the wording of this bill, and the thing that disturbs me, and which prompted an amendment in the committee which was not pressed strongly, is that the money authorized to be appropriated by this bill should be fixed, I think, before we take this action. I think we should know how much of these commodity stocks are going to be moved. In fact, a little later on I will offer an amendment cutting out this wording "including the corporation's investment in the commodities," and I have tried to pick a round figure that we would authorize for transportation and distribution costs.

Now, if you will read down in the lower part of page 2 we find here that any assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used in advance of such appropriations or payments for carrying out the purposes of this act. Not knowing how much the transportation is going to amount to since there are no other figures available to use as an example here, it would be possible to use \$90 million of Commodity Credit Corporation funds to be spent for the transportation and distribution of \$10 million worth of commodity stocks.

On the other hand, that would tie up \$100 million worth of Commodity Credit funds out of the appropriation we have already made, which has been made for the purpose of supporting the prices of commodities. We have appropriated that money for a specific purpose. Yet if we pass this bill without providing that the appropriation shall be made before the bill is put into effect, we are

taking money which has been appropriated to the Department of Agriculture and in fact transferring it to the Mutual Security Administration for them to use. I do not like that part of the bill.

Another thing we have done in this bill, and I have made this objection to at least two other bills we have passed in this House—evidently other people did not have the same idea I have, and I have not been successful in putting this point across—is that we are following the practice in this Congress of writing the most indefinite language possible into bills. I call your attention to the way this bill is drawn. It says that the President may make such transfers to such agencies in such manner and upon such terms and conditions, as he deems appropriate. If that does not give the President the authority to go to any agency of Government and to transfer money if the Commodity Credit Corporation does not have enough down here to meet it, I do not know what it does. He can make any kind of terms he wants to, any kind of conditions he deems appropriate to carry out this bill.

I resent using the Commodity Credit funds for carrying out this mutual security program, although I voted for the mutual security program. I have no objection to using the surplus stocks which the Commodity Credit Corporation owns. I feel they should be used. I think we would be derelict in letting those commodities spoil or deteriorate to such a point that they would become useless. I think we would be subject to all kinds of criticism. I think they should be used. But I think we should make some changes in this bill, and I am going to offer an amendment a little later, and I wanted to explain the position on which this amendment would be predicated.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. What does the gentleman mean by saying he objects to the use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds? What Commodity Credit Corporation funds are involved in this bill?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They are involved to this extent, Mr. Chairman. It says "any assets." I think "assets" would include the appropriation that has been made to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Certainly that would be one of the assets that they have available, would it not?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, the assets of Commodity Credit Corporation consists almost entirely of the stocks of goods it has on hand. Of course, that is what this deals with. We are trying to make some useful disposition of some of these stocks. When we do we are going to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of those goods, by an appropriation. Does the gentleman see anything wrong with that?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But you are not making that appropriation, you are using this money. You are using agricultural funds here for the Mutual Security thing. You are using it out of pro-

portion to the funds themselves. That is my objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The bill reads, on page 2, line 12, that this money shall be expended for all transfers and deliveries under this act. That is the money of the Commodity Credit Corporation, is it not?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That was my impression. That is the point I have been trying to make since I have been up here. I evidently have not done a very good job of it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, discussion of an agricultural bill is hardly in my line, but as a simple citizen of the United States and a very humble Member of this House, what happens to the United States is very definitely in my line.

I happen to be one of those who are finding it increasingly difficult to keep up with the accelerated pace at which our Government is giving away the United States of America and undermining the economic fiscal foundations of this great and wonderful Republic. I was astonished this morning to find this bill on the calendar. I know nothing about the agricultural program. I do not know what the consequences of this bill may or may not be on the support program. But what I do know is that this bill will authorize and will in effect accomplish a \$100 million increase in the national debt, and yet on the day after tomorrow, Mr. Chairman, we may be asked to sanctify some of the economic excesses of the last 2 or 3 years by voting to increase the debt limit, that is something which I, for one, have no intention of doing. I hope the Congress will have the courage to stand up and say no at least on that. Let me point out that this little \$100 million, I think it was the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], who said it was such a small item that it did not amount to anything, comes on top of the \$55 billion that we have spent for foreign aid in 12 years, to which should be added the \$15 billion more of foreign-aid money which will be available to be spent when the current new-money bill finally passes. It comes on top of the cost of maintaining 1,600,000 Americans in uniform in 49 countries at a cost of \$16 billion, on top of \$130 million of wheat for Pakistan, on top of our own defense program.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman anticipated my question and answered it very adequately. I thank you, sir.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield for a brief question. My time is running out, and

there is something more that I want to say.

Mr. HILL. Is the gentleman aware of the amount of money this Nation already has in surplus food products?

Mr. COUDERT. I am aware of it.

Mr. HILL. Do you know what sum it is?

Mr. COUDERT. It is \$3 billion.

Mr. HILL. Of course, it is, it is close to \$3 billion.

Mr. COUDERT. I do not doubt it.

Mr. HILL. We already own these food surpluses—do we or do we not?

Mr. COUDERT. I suppose we do.

Mr. HILL. All right, then what are you talking about when you say we are going to supply more money? You are not going to supply a single dime.

Mr. COUDERT. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. HILL. But you are giving them this food.

Mr. COUDERT. Oh no, you are not under this bill. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we will be doing exactly what we did in the Pakistan bill. We raid the Bureau of Engraving for another \$100 million and put it in the kitty of the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the fund.

Mr. HILL. No, the gentleman misses the point entirely.

Mr. COUDERT. I just read the bill.

Mr. HILL. Well, you did not understand it—that is your trouble.

Mr. COUDERT. That is quite possible. Anybody who can understand the ramifications of your farm program has to have wisdom, indeed.

Mr. HILL. That might be a reason for not discussing the farm program.

Mr. COUDERT. No, I am talking about the national debt limit and taxes.

Mr. HILL. You are not talking about this bill, but let us get down to this bill. If we do not pay one single dime of these funds—let us get that—we can still pick up this food under this bill without any appropriation if the President wished to use the high-handed methods used in the past and supply free food as it belongs now to the Federal Government.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. We are not spending any new money. If you do not use this surplus food it will deteriorate. There is no question about it. These surplus foods are deteriorating even if we do say that they are not.

Mr. COUDERT. I did not yield to the gentleman to make a speech.

Mr. HILL. But you gave me the time to make it.

Mr. COUDERT. I yielded to the gentleman to ask a question.

Mr. HILL. Let me ask the gentleman another question. We will give you plenty of questions that you cannot answer.

Mr. COUDERT. I know that the past administration has created a farm problem and that there are great farm surpluses and that something must be done

about them, but I do not see why on top of the existing cost of the surpluses presently in stock and stored in old ships or stored in the fields and under trees, we have to add to the national debt \$100 million to replace the cost of those products and have the taxpayers pay for them not once but twice.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I do not yield. I just want to make one further point. The basis of this bill is that it is a famine bill; it is for the relief of the poor and starving all over the world. The fact that this line is completely phony and for public consumption only arises from the simple premise that we passed a foreign aid bill the other day. Do you remember that? That bill added \$5 billion to the \$10 billion already appropriated. In that little bill that will add to the national debt another very large sum, there is from \$100 million to \$250 million authorized to the President to buy these very commodities that this bill provides for. Let us not fool ourselves.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. HELLER. Does the gentleman take the position that this bill is part of the giveaway program of this administration?

Mr. COUDERT. This administration is proposing it. That is all I can say. This administration, I gather, also is going to ask for an increase in the debt limit sometime this week, if you can believe what the papers say.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman not agree with me that the precedent having been set on the Pakistan bill, we are back here in 1 or 2 weeks with a similar bill, and next week we will be here with another, and this thing will be unending?

Mr. COUDERT. It seems to be that way, and that is why I am on the floor. I cannot keep up with it, and I find it difficult to sit still as these things go charging through.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Is it not a fact that this bill will actually cost us more money, because we are agreeing to pay the freight on it to the foreign country?

Mr. COUDERT. Oh, of course. I assume that amendment is either in the bill or will be in later.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. This will not cost \$100 million, because it has already cost us that. Now we authorize an appropriation for another \$100 million to supplement this, so that actually this bill will cost us \$200 million, because we have already paid for the \$100 million surplus.

Mr. COUDERT. I am glad the gentleman made the point, because that is a very important point. The commodi-

ties that became the subject of this bill will have cost the taxpayers a mere \$200 million. The gentleman is quite right. If we do this, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] pointed out, this bill expires in March, so in March they will be down here with another one. Let us hope it will be only another \$100 million.

Mr. SUTTON. I might say to the gentleman this bill itself is an authorization for an additional appropriation of \$100 million to repay the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. COUDERT. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON], whom I love most dearly, that this is only an authorization.

Mr. COUDERT. Now I am not going to yield to the gentleman for a speech.

Mr. HILL. Then answer me, how do you get surplus farm products? You have been eating off of them for the last 25 years. How do you get farm surpluses?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to answer that.

Mr. GROSS. We get some of the surpluses by purchasing and importing from Canada, piling wheat on surplus wheat, and we get more of our surpluses by importing dry whole milk from foreign countries which is liquified and converted to butterfat to pile on the butter surpluses. The Agricultural Committee can, and should, do something about that instead of dissipating the resources of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I can have the attention of the House on this matter, because I think involved here is a very serious problem. At the time that we had the Pakistan bill under consideration I raised the question then that I was afraid we were setting out on what might become a general program of having the farmer produce surpluses for the purpose of giving them away. I am one of the strongest advocates of the present farm program, but that program contemplates a means whereby the farmers may collectively hold their production down in line with the foreseeable market and thereby be entitled to a fair price.

I know this measure has appeal. To give what we have and do not need to somebody who does have need sounds good. We can see what happened in Berlin. But, Mr. Chairman, the President has an \$85 billion fund to meet emergency not only that but through the mutual-security program, passed last week, the administration has funds to meet any foreign policy problem that may arise, that is economic problem. If they need food, we can give it to them under the mutual-security program and you and the President know it. This is not that—it is a means or effort to solve

the agriculture problem. The President requested authority—which if fully granted, would have authorized him to give away to foreign people the whole \$3 billion worth of farm commodities we have on hand—when admittedly no country has the need for them now. True it is that the Agriculture Committee has cut the request of \$100 million. This solution is no solution to the farm problem. Just like 90 percent support for butter which will not keep is no answer but which will doubtless be used as a factor to end the farm program, this is a move in the same direction. If the American people can be led to believe the farm program lets the farmer produce too much, give away the surplus and get a good price for it all the program is gone—and anyone should know it. Our President is a good man but he does not know farming. He is a good man but he is a professional military man and they, as a group are not savers of money. The American people opposed the spending record of the last administration. There has been little change in this one.

The farm program is in trouble and that trouble will not be solved by giving away your surpluses and letting your farmers produce more surpluses and cost us more money. Such a course is not good for the farmers for it will lead to losing the farm program in the long run. The only answer is to let our farmers hold their production in line with the demand. We all know it, and it is time my good friends on the Committee on Agriculture on the left who opposed this kind of thing in the past give their administration the benefit of their experience and their know-how and give them a vote in line with the vote that they cast when Charlie Brannan was trying to do this kind of thing on a much smaller scale than this. Gentlemen, this country needs you to have courage, and it needs it badly.

The American farmers are citizens and taxpayers too but it would be better if these commodities spoiled if need be rather than to set a course that might wreck the farm program. Why deplete our own soil to produce what we do not need? Why should the farmer spend his money producing things we do not need? If we set up this means of outlet, we will have more production, then more give away, and more production—and then no farm program.

We have spent \$129 billion getting ready for the Russian threat, producing planes, materiel of war, equipment, tanks, and all those things. The \$3 billion that we have invested in agricultural commodities is not too much for security if this threat of communism exists to the extent that we have spent \$129 billion to be ready in a military way. I say further that the only difference is that where the farmer is concerned, we have let these commodities, needed for security, be an influence to depress his prices for the crops we use, because the Government has not stockpiled agricultural commodities. We have not given the farmer a firm contract for cost plus a profit as we have manufacturers and labor and he has

built up this \$3 billion in commodities, largely at his expense, but we must not try to solve the problem with this give-away program, if there is a problem, because all that you have is an opening of the door to producing for the future for the purpose of giving it away.

It is unsound anyway you take it.

Now the next thing; we have had foreign aid; we passed that authorization bill and this Congress thought it fixed the amount that was going into it. Last year I found out for the first time that under Mutual Security as we have had it not only did we give foreign countries the money but we then sold them our commodities at reduced prices thereby increasing foreign aid by an undetermined amount, and those figures are hard to get. But then this Congress adopted an amendment I offered to require them to at least get the prevailing price in the United States. You on my left voted for my amendment then. Now that we have just passed the foreign-aid bill again and we have set the amount, is it sound to come along here and add an additional amount and thereby endanger the farm program? Listen. I am talking facts to you. You have a Secretary of Agriculture who is a fine gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not in this instance, but I think in the interest of expediting the business of the House I shall have to object to further requests to speak beyond 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Under section 3 it states that no program of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this act after March 15, 1954. Does that mean you have \$100 million to spend from now to next March? Where does the gentleman get the extension next year?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say this: My friends on the left realize this is an unwise request for authority to give away \$3 billion in commodities. The original request was without limit insofar as the Commodity Credit Corporation stocks were concerned.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The President also said: "Under such limitations as the Congress may see fit to impose."

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not want to be unfair, but I say that when the committee under the able leadership of my good friend from Kansas, reduced it down to \$100 million and limited the time for giving away what we have even though we do not know who, if anybody, needs it, until March of next year, it

was an indication they did not go for it very strong. But a little bit of this thing is too much. That is the point I would like to make.

Your Secretary of Agriculture, too, is inexperienced in Government. I have had him seated across the table many times. You have not had time to read the reports. He is a fine Christian gentleman with many experiences in many fields. But this is not the first time he has gone Charlie Brannan one better. He sent down here a request to give the tobacco farmers support prices when they had refused to limit their production. He got us into what amounts to another potato program under the dairy program where you are supporting perishables without limit at 90 percent of parity. The only outcome is to lose our shirts. Surely the potato program should have been a lesson to him. Having gone into that, I plead with you to give your administration the benefit of your experience and let them know what will not work, because from these requests they certainly need it. When I say that I am not trying to look after your politics; I am trying to look after the farm program and the American people. We are in this boat together. You happen to be running it now. Somebody else may be running it next time. In either case we need to give to this agriculture problem the best thought we can and accept our responsibility as Members of this Congress.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. He is always eminently fair. Is it not true that we do have an unusually large surplus on hand today because the prior administration and Secretary Brannan asked for an unusual production throughout those years? Now, had an all-out war come, of course, he would have been a hero. As it has turned out, we are burdened with an unusual surplus. I think the gentleman will be fair enough to admit that.

Mr. WHITTEN. I admit that, and I say I took issue with him and pointed out to him there was no foreseeable market for the cotton that was asked for. That was true in many other instances. I opposed the Democrats just as strongly as I do you. I am asking you to show the courage I hope I have shown in differing with my administration when they got off on the wrong tangent. Certainly yours needs help if any administration ever needs it. We cannot have a farm program that produces beyond need, and gives the production away, when you have to work hard to find someone to take it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think it should be said in answer to what the gentleman stated that it is agreed by everyone this will not solve the surplus problem.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my colleague from Mississippi. You can see very readily that it will not solve it. This

\$3-billion program reserve I do not think is out of line with what we are building up for national defense otherwise. It is not out of line with what we have invested to be prepared elsewhere; but if it is a problem to the point you say it is, giving away commodities of the value of \$100 million is not going to solve it.

Involved here is the basic question of whether your farm program is one whereby we enable the farmers to hold their production in line with demand, saving the cost of producing unnecessary surpluses and thereby entitle them to a fair price, or you are going to open it up and let them produce beyond our needs, give the surplus away, then by restoring the Commodity Credit Corporation stock invite the same thing all over again, thereby wrecking the American farm program which is so very good and which has meant so much to this country. The President has money to meet emergencies; Mutual Security has funds to supply foreign needs.

I hope you will vote as you have voted up until your President asked for this, because there is nothing in the record to show that his experience in any way compares with yours on this farm problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: Page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out the words "(including the corporation's investment in the commodities)" and insert in lieu thereof "of funds heretofore appropriated for the use of the Mutual Security Agency."

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOPE. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane and that it constitutes an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I certainly do, Mr. Chairman. This is not an appropriation. I am referring to an appropriation already made and which would void the appropriation that the gentleman refers to. I am also stating that the cost of distributing these products shall be made from funds heretofore appropriated and am also providing that the Commodity Credit Corporation not pay for the distribution but merely provide the surplus stocks which I think would be a distinct improvement to the bill. It would offer more commodities for the use of starving people. It would not use Commodity Credit Corporation funds for the transfer and it certainly does not create any additional appropriation for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. This amendment, as drafted, would divert previously appropriated funds to a new purpose. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the committee amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the committee amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Does the gentleman have a legitimate amendment he intends to offer?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, certainly I would not offer any amendment if I did not think it was legitimate.

Mr. HOPE. It is not pro forma amendment that the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No.* It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Are there any other amendments to the committee amendments? I withdraw my motion, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the committee amendment and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 2, line 10, strike out the figure "100" immediately following the dollar mark and insert in lieu thereof "50" and further amend the paragraph by striking the parenthesis and the wording within the parenthesis in lines 10 and 11.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention again to line 10, where it says, "Not more than \$100 million—including the Corporation's investment in the commodities." My amendment would reduce this amount to \$50 million. It would strike out the words "including the Corporation's investment in the commodities."

I do this for 2 reasons, 1, to reduce the amount of money that will be appropriated and limit that money to the cost of distribution. It would remove the limitation from the surplus commodities which could be distributed during this period of time. I think that is clear. You are going to use your commodities for the starving people but you are going to reduce the amount to \$50 million. I think that in the long run you will be able to distribute more commodities than under the present bill. That should meet with the desires of those who want to help the starving people. It should also help those who want to make a smaller appropriation. That is why I think the amendment should be adopted. I think it is a reasonable one and meets the two objections.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment to the committee amendment and of course strongly favor the committee amendment. The amendment to the committee amendment proposes to cut this amount in two. May I point out that this is the first real giveaway money provided for such agricultural surpluses since we had the Pakistan bill. The \$100 million to \$250 million in the Mutual Security Administration bill provided that agricultural surpluses were to be sold for foreign currency, and in the Mutual Security Administration bill all agricultural commodities provided to other countries have to be paid for in counterpart funds, foreign currency deposits.

Let me comment briefly on the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. He spoke of our President as being merely a soldier who thought only in terms of spending. I remember hearing from President Eisenhower himself how he was raised on a Kansas farm. He said, "We were poor, but the interesting thing is we did not know we were poor." He described his life as a Kansas farm boy. He knew farming, and the value of a dollar.

The gentleman from Mississippi says it would be better to let this surplus spoil than to use it this way. I heard the President himself in describing this program say "It is wrong to let food spoil when people are hungry." That is just how simple this proposition is. That is the great difference between the southern farm bloc's spokesman and the President. Shall we let the surplus spoil, or use it for hungry people?

The farm program is a great problem, unquestionably. I happen to feel that the best analysis made of it that I have heard was made by our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING]. We got into the habit through various Government support programs and other schemes of producing more than we now need. That problem must be solved. But the fact is that we have \$3 billion of surplus commodities on hand. Possibly \$100 million of it is likely to spoil if we do not use it. One way to use it is as the President suggests, to take care of people that are hungry. That is what this bill is about. I hope the amount is left at \$100 million and I hope that the committee amendment is adopted, because it provides an effective additional use of these surpluses behind the Iron Curtain. I hope that the bill receives the support of the House.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, does not the gentleman know it would provide more surplus if this amendment were adopted?

Mr. VORYS. No.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It certainly would.

(Mr. NEAL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, while the debate to determine when the cost of

excess farm products, proposed to be sent as gifts to needy people of the world, should be charged to one Government agency or the other goes on without agreement, the real issue before us hangs on the question of whether we continue to impound these perishable commodities, with every assurance that they must eventually spoil, or whether to adopt the more humane policy of sharing it with hungry people while it remains fit for human consumption.

There can only be one answer, if we as a Christian nation are animated by a desire to generate good will toward the citizens of the underprivileged areas of the world.

After 2 world wars and 3 years of undeclared hostilities in Korea, we find our friends throughout the world either deserting us outright or pretending friendship in the hope of getting some of our dollar handouts.

Now that we find it no longer possible to strain our financial structure, already stretched to the breaking point, to adopt the policy of distributing a portion of our food surpluses is not only a more effective way to help our friends, but just good, common sense.

It is among the hungry people of the world that hate, jealousy, and resentment finds expression in anti-Americanism. Feed the hungry, cease trying to change their way of life, leave them alone to solve their difficulties in their own way. If they want more of our American way of life, let us extend a welcome; teach them our methods which they can carry home to adopt as they see fit. Mutual Security Administration dollar diplomacy has not been the answer. It is time we look to more effective means of winning foreign friends.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri will not be adopted. The amount of \$100 million as has been so ably said by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is the only money that can be used freely in the distribution of these commodities. He has pointed out how the other funds that have been mentioned must be taken from other sources or require the use of counterpart funds. As I said earlier in the afternoon, we have been at a disadvantage here in the cold war, very largely because this Government has not had the power or the authority to move rapidly into situations where we could not only give relief but where we could serve the best interests of this country.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The fact is that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri will limit the \$50 million to transfers and deliveries and will leave unlimited the amount of commodities.

Mr. HOPE. I am not sure. I thought that would be the interpretation of it in the first place, but I am not sure it would be. There is that question, of course, as to what it actually does. But

I am going on the theory that it does limit the amount that can be transferred, and I think the amount of \$100 million should be left intact because while we do not know how much may be needed, I do not believe we want to tie the hands of the President at this time when tremendous things are happening all over the world and where the use of a very small amount of these commodities might change the course of history. I have in my hand last night's Washington Evening Star saying that 250,000 East Berliners had come across the line to accept the food supplied by us that the West German Government was giving away. That simply shows the tremendous impact that anything of this kind has in the hectic situation which exists in the world today. Let us not tie the hands of the President. Let us give him the authority he needs to deal with the situation while Congress is not in session. That is the extent of time covered by this legislation. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 40, noes 94.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I did not finish all I wanted to say about this bill in the general debate. One of the reasons which has been advanced here why we should not hesitate to pass this bill is that by its terms it is limited to March 15, 1954. You know as well as I that that might just as well not be in the bill. That date will not bring this program to an end.

The first year I came to Congress we had a plan to aid European nations. We were told then that that plan would go for 2 years and then expire, because during the 2-year period we would have given them all the aid they needed. That was 7 years ago, and we have had foreign-aid plans ever since. We had the European recovery plan. We had the Marshall plan. We had aid for Greece and Turkey. These programs then graduated into the MSA plan, and the Lord only knows what it will be when the MSA plan runs out. But there is one thing we can be sure of, it will be succeeded by some other plan.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I hope the gentleman does not forget UNRRA.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I was not here when UNRRA came along. All these others followed UNRRA. This bill is so worded that only \$20 million may go to one country. That means that we will split this up five ways and pass it around and whet the appetite of 5 different countries in the world.

They will take \$20 million each and they will be back here on March 16, 1954, and ask for some real donations. And then we will be faced with the proposition that we still have surpluses. The governments of the hungry peoples of the world will take all we give them, and the proposal will be for \$200 million then, or possibly \$1 billion.

We have had the argument here that Commodity Credit surpluses will spoil unless this bill passes. And if they spoil, then the farm program will be destroyed.

Is there anyone here who does not remember the time when we had these piles of Irish potatoes, and kerosene was poured on them and they were destroyed? That did not destroy the farm program, but it did serve this purpose. It pointed out to the American people the fact that the program was being operated in the wrong way. That situation was corrected. If butter spoils and if powdered eggs spoil and if some of these other commodities spoil, it will have the effect, probably, of spotlighting this program and it might goad the Congress, the administration, and the Government into working out a plan that could be operated on a sensible basis.

If we are in this dire position which it is said we are in today, why cannot a plan be worked out by which we could sell these surpluses to these foreign nations and accept their local currency for them?

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. There is \$100 million to \$250 million provided for that purpose in the MSA bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Then why do we not send them these products under that provision of the MSA bill and not add \$100 million onto the shoulders of the already overburdened taxpayer.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. In other words, we are going to spend \$100 million to \$250 million of cash money, of dollars, to get that currency.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. This bill simply is a foot in the door to open up another giveaway program, a worldwide program and put the upkeep of more countries on the backs of the United States taxpayers. That is going to be the net result of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SUTTON. The Chair had already recognized the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked for what purpose the gentleman from Ohio had risen; the Chair had not recognized him.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending at the desk and have had it there for some time and asked for recognition. The Chair advised me that I would be recognized immediately after the committee amendment was disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas withdraw his motion?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I did not know that the gentleman from Ohio had an amendment. I withdraw my motion for the time being, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Six Members have indicated a desire to be heard on this amendment. The Chair will divide the time equally between them.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEICHEL: On page 2, line 16, after the period at the end of section 1 insert "At least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of agricultural commodities made available under this act and transported from the United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] is recognized.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the people of the United States are deeply concerned for the security of our country and they know that American ships are a vital part of our national defense. The Congress knowing the desires of the American people for protection and the need of American ships for emergencies, have expressed and enacted laws to have moving and keep active American ocean-going ships.

I need not remind you of the accomplishments of American ships in the last war as well as in the Korean situation. However, I rise with reference to the pending legislation covering the use of surplus agricultural commodities in the United States being used by our Government to aid the famine stricken and those in need of food in other parts of the world.

May I remind my colleagues that all the legislation giving assistance and help to foreign nations during this postwar period, have provided that 50 percent of such aid cargoes be carried in American ships. This has been pursuant to enactments of the Congress expressing the policy to keep going an active American merchant marine that we can depend upon for ourselves in time of emergency.

I offer this amendment so that we might carry on the same policy that we have had with reference to the transportation of such relief cargoes so that 50 percent might be carried in American ships and that we might keep an active American fleet in operation.

Mr. Chairman, may I on behalf of the people and the Members of the Congress ask that 50 percent of these cargoes be carried in American ships.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Can the gentleman tell us how much this will add to the cost of this project?

Mr. WEICHEL. I do not know that it will cost any more. When the cargoes are carried on berth space, the foreign and American lines are members of the same rate conference; and would most likely charge the same rates.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How much would the freight be? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. WEICHEL. I do not know; it would depend on the volume shipped.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has just been offered to the Committee by the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and which has the full support of the members of that committee who are familiar with the American merchant marine.

I wish to point out this fact, that it has been the policy of this country and of the Congress of the United States to write this provision into every foreign-aid program. The American merchant marine has been going down while these foreign countries have been building their merchant marine up. There is no shipbuilding in this country, while there is plenty of shipbuilding in foreign countries.

Contrary to the thought expressed by one of the previous speakers, the gentleman from Texas, the rates are not high on American vessels. In connection with the hauling of wheat to Pakistan, the first ship was a United States military sea transport vessel and by a book-keeping process the rate was \$26 a ton. The two subsequent vessels that sailed were privately owned American vessels and the rate was \$17 a ton. The lowest figure quoted by foreign tramp vessels was around \$14 a ton. So the differential in rate does not make a big difference. However, by adopting this amendment we are guaranteeing that we will keep a defense arm alive that is important to the future security of this country. I am sure that the committee will adopt the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries indicated a moment ago, this 50-50 policy has heretofore been adopted by the Congress in all of the foreign aid programs of every nature. This Congress in earlier years adopted a merchant marine program which called for Government support of our maritime industry. The gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY] men-

tioned that our maritime industry is an arm of our defense, which is so.

Prior to World War II the attitude of the Congress during those previous years was such that the Congresses failed in their obligation to our American merchant marine. When World War II came about we found ourselves short of shipping necessary to carry our men and our supplies to the battlefield. As a consequence, during World War II we spent about \$21 billion in building up our merchant marine. How many billions of dollars we could have saved if we had had an adequate merchant marine at the outbreak of the war no one can tell. I would guess a minimum of several billion dollars could have been saved if we had simply recognized the necessity of maintaining an adequate merchant marine. Such a merchant marine would have undoubtedly shortened the war and saved countless lives. We must not again be caught short in the matter of having sufficient ships for emergencies.

I trust the committee will adopt the amendment which has been offered by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It will help to keep our shipping in a healthy condition. Let us not be pennywise and pound foolish in this matter.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DORN of New York. Is it not true that all members of the merchant marine are in unanimity in supporting this amendment?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman is correct so far as I am aware.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. I concur in what the gentleman has said and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I would like to join with the gentleman in urging that this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield my time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture if it is not a fact that such additional costs as might be incurred as a result of adoption of the pending amendment will be taken from the \$100 million because that is the overall limitation fixed in the bill?

Mr. HOPE. That is true. I do not think anyone knows what the cost will be because we do not know how much money will be used and do not know what arrangements will be made for

transportation. Some countries may pay the transportation cost. If it is distributed through CARE, that organization has arranged with 26 countries by which they pay transportation. But whatever it would be it would, of course, have to be deducted from the \$100 million.

Mr. COOLEY. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture does agree with me that if additional costs are incurred they will have to be taken out of the \$100 million under the \$100 million limitation?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; that is true. All transportation costs are paid by this country.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask one other question for the benefit of the membership of the House. I have been asked whether or not these commodities might be made available to individuals behind the Iron Curtain. There cannot be any doubt about it, I suppose.

Mr. HOPE. No. I am sure the gentleman, of course, will agree with me that the language is very plain. The matter was very thoroughly discussed in the committee, and it was the intent of the committee that under certain circumstances commodities might be delivered to friendly people behind the Iron Curtain. That is under the amendment adopted in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to say anything on this particular provision except to continue what I was saying to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. I am not sure that I understood his question about delivery behind the Iron Curtain, but I took it that he meant situations such as exist in Eastern Germany at the present time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, of course I had in mind the situation in Eastern Germany at the present time, but the power and authority conferred by this bill does not restrict the President to East Germany. He could actually deliver commodities in Moscow if he deemed it appropriate to do so under the language of the bill.

Mr. HOPE. He could deliver food to friendly and needy populations without regard to their governments, provided such commodities will be distributed to relieve distress among the populations. The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. HILL, read into the RECORD a letter from the State Department saying that it was not the intent to deliver commodities to Russia or Communist China. That is in the RECORD.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. Is it not true that the only part of this bill in which the American people will get some return in so far as benefits are concerned is by this amendment, which will at least, afford some employment to our American shipping industry? That is the only benefit that I can see up to this time in this debate where the American people will get some return.

Mr. HOPE. I would not agree with the sweeping nature of the gentleman's statement. I think it is a little too sweeping.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Any assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriations or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this act.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to make a speech but just to make a few observations. It seems to me that we take up more time legislating for countries across the sea than we do for our own people. We do not have to worry about surpluses. If we keep letting the immigration bars down as we did a day or two ago, when Congress approved the admittance of over 200,000 immigrants to the United States, they will eat up all of our surpluses; we will not have any surpluses. I have heard several of my colleagues talk about the Christian spirit and brotherly love, as though it was up to us to feed everybody in the entire world. The Good Book does not even teach that at all. Just a few weeks ago Congress killed a bill to build some schoolhouses in the crowded areas to take care of some children in the United States of America, which would have helped the schools in the defense area in my district.

Just a few days ago a colleague from Tennessee had a little editorial from one of his little newspapers in the drought area. This article said that they could not buy schoolbooks, they could not buy clothes and food for those children to go to school. Where? In the United States, not in Pakistan; right here at home. Charity begins at home. The Bible says:

He that provideth not for his own household is worse than an infidel.

Let us take care of our own people for awhile. Recently we had a bad flood down in my district, the water stood on part of the land 9 feet deep for more than 60 days. Why? Because this Congress refused to provide \$300,000 for a little dam. Are we going to take care of the foreigners before we take care of the people here at home?

I expect some of our old people on the old-age pension rolls could use a little butter on their bread if you gave them a chance. I have been told by some of them that they have not as much as tasted butter in 2 years. Where? In the United States of America. Yet some of our great statesmen want to send it to every part of the world while our own people are in need.

You listen to me. This police action in Korea is not over. Do not kid yourselves. In my opinion we are being taken up a blind alley. Do not worry. We are going to need and need badly every bit of surplus America has to fight the next war because we are going to have to fight it alone.

Oh, we have talked about our allies in Korea. We had to have England. Yes, we had to have her. While she traded with Communist China, while she used her ships to haul war supplies to them to kill our men, who were dying at the rate of 127 men a day. Then we call her our friend. I think it is time that somebody stands up and speaks for the people in America.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, one of the Members on our side spoke to me in the aisle a moment ago and said, "You can always tell when the Committee on Agriculture has something on the floor. Believe me, there is a lot of sound and a lot of fury." Apparently today is no exception.

A number of our friends on my right, particularly from some of the southern sections of the country, seem quite disappointed with some of our positions and some of our activities, and have indicated what to them is some surprise about it. I might return the compliment by saying that I have been a little surprised at some of their attitudes on occasion, and I do not like to say that.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] seeks to indict and condemn our great President because, he says, he is a military man, he does not know anything about farming. Well, I do not know how you learn about farming. I doubt if very many people here have plowed a furrow in their lives. But then he went on to say that because he is a military man, all he knows is how to spend money.

I have been listening in recent weeks and in recent months to the gentleman from Mississippi, and I must say I have been a little bit surprised with him on some of his statements. He must have forgotten that on the matter of spending for national defense the President himself recommended a budget cut under the Truman budget of some \$5 billion, and we just today in the House completed an action that cut more than \$6 billion out of it. Our President has gone along. Our President whom you would seek to indict as a great spender, and which charge I deny, cut billions of dollars out of the Truman request for the MSA and the Congress cut some more. Certainly that does not bear out the condemnation of the President.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say to the gentleman that I had no intention of condemning the President. When I point out his inexperience in this field, it is truthful and it is based upon the facts in the case. When I ask those who have worked with agriculture here in the Congress to give him the benefit of their experience, I think I am doing him a favor, and certainly I am not indicting

him as a man nor as the President. I have the highest admiration for him, and I think he needs some help on your side which he is not getting.

Mr. HALLECK. That is about on a par with some of the other statements the gentleman made. You must understand I have the highest regard for the gentleman and when you disavow any indictment of the President, I am glad to hear you say that, but do not indict the rest of us for what you claim may be some failure to exercise our judgment. We have been exercising it. May I say to the gentleman we have a pretty good, cooperative man in the White House who has listened to many of the recommendations that have come from us and has demonstrated the greatest willingness to cooperate with the Congress and to work out a program. But be that as it may, the gentleman who just preceded me says he knows people who haven't had any butter for 2 years. Now they may be eating that oleo that you folks make. We have plenty of butter. It is not a shortage of butter that is bothering us. There are a lot of people who are beginning to wonder and to be disturbed about the millions of pounds of butter that are piling up in this country under the farm program. Maybe you gentlemen who are dealing with that program directly are not disturbed about it, but I happen to be one person who is disturbed about it. We have seen these surpluses accumulate. We have just enacted legislation to try to relieve the impact of quotas to be established in wheat production by increasing the number of acres. Can you not see in that a danger signal? Finally, in connection with the suggestion that has been made by the President, after consultation with the legislative leaders, I come to the fact that here we have these great stores of food with much concern on every hand as to whether or not the consumption or the demand of the people in this country to use them will reach the point where they will not become unmanageable, and we are disturbed about what we are going to do about it. I think there we come to the nub of this whole proposition. All that has been requested is that with respect to these surplus commodities, and there are surpluses, there is no question about that, that the President have this limited, prescribed authority for the limited time involved, to carry out the provisions of the act which we here are seeking to pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes. I have one question that I want the gentleman to answer for me.

Mr. HALLECK. I will try to answer the gentleman right now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture said that he was going to object to any additional time being granted to anybody.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana relinquishes the floor.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet before the motion was put.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] desires to offer a motion. I think he ought to be allowed to do it. Let us not get rough. We are just 3 or 4 days before adjournment, or a month, and we have got plenty of time to finish this bill. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] especially wants more than 2 minutes, and I think he is entitled to it.

Will the Chair recognize the gentleman to offer an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Is this the preferential motion which the gentleman said he was offering?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands it is an amendment to the motion offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. WHITTEN. What I was preparing was a preferential motion.

Mr. RAYBURN. That was not my idea of what the gentleman was trying to do.

Mr. WHITTEN. I was trying to get recognition for the purpose of offering an amendment to the motion. I am sorry the minority leader misunderstood my purpose. I did not have a chance to tell him. I would like to offer an amendment to the motion made by the gentleman from Kansas that the debate end in 35 minutes, so that those of us who desire to speak will have an opportunity to do so. I think that is fair, in view of the statements just made.

Mr. HOPE. I have no objection to the gentleman offering the amendment notwithstanding the fact that we have already voted on the motion, but I would not want to agree to the 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not yet announced the result of the vote.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman's request was a unanimous-consent request, was it not?

Mr. RAYBURN. He has offered a motion which the Chair has entertained.

The gentleman from Mississippi is offering an amendment now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] to the motion made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], that all debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITTEN) there were—ayes 78, noes 99.

So the amendment to the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas that all debate on section 2 and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE) there were—ayes 112, noes 86.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. HOPE and Mr. SUTTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 115, noes 89.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is always to be regretted that tempers get short when debate runs on, and especially do I regret that this issue has arisen with my friend from Indiana. I have the highest regard for the majority leader; I have the highest appreciation for the problems which he has. I say that the speeches I have made, the votes I have cast in this session of the Congress, are in line with the stand I have taken in times past. I differed with President Truman and said so. I differ with President Eisenhower when he tries to outdo Truman and I say so, though I admit I do not have the responsibilities that some others have of trying to conform my own views with those of some other group or with a group of leaders. I said and I say the President of the United States is not experienced in the field of agriculture. I state nothing except the facts, and in saying that I am quoting him, because in his speeches throughout the length and breadth of this country during the last campaign he said he had no knowledge of agriculture, but would have the benefit and advice of those who did know the subject, and in my pleas today to the Republican membership of the Committee on Agriculture and others who are experienced in that field when I have asked you to give the President the benefit of their advice, I was doing nothing more than he solicited at the time he was running. In my judgment you folks have changed your position. In the last Congress when you were in the minority, in most instances you cooperated with our views. At that time we were able to prevent the

administration from making a Cabinet position out of the Federal Security Agency, and we got your votes almost to a man. It was bad then. When Charley Brannan wanted unlimited power to reorganize the Department of Agriculture we had the votes of our Republican friends to prevent it. In this Congress most of you have gone back on both of those moves, these same individuals. That is your privilege, but I am entitled to point out the inconsistency of your positions. In the last Congress we gave many things away. In this Congress they give them away and pay the freight on them. In the last Congress there were many things that I thought were mistakes and which I said then were mistakes, and now I say to you, gentlemen, you are making the same mistakes all over again. You admitted 240,000 immigrants extra in this country yesterday. You opposed that last session. The point of it is, it is inconsistent with the position that you took before and it smacks of politics. The American people, rightly or wrongly, elected to bring about what they thought was a change in administration and they did it largely upon the record that you gentlemen on the left, when you were in the minority, made in voting for sound Americanism.

You, in my opinion, are now deserting that sound record. Now we find you going one better on practically everything that has been wrong, as I see it, in the last administration. I do not want to make this a time of levity, but I would like to tell you a story I heard the other day, which I think is most appropriate, judging by the action you have taken in this Congress.

A young lady called on a doctor and said, "Doctor, you are a psychiatrist, and I want to talk to you about my brother." The doctor said, "What is wrong with him?" She said, "Well, he thinks he is a hen. He goes around picking up things with his teeth; he clucks and he cackles and he molts in season and he lays eggs." The doctor said, "Young lady, how long has that condition existed?" She said, "Twelve years." The doctor said, "Well, why have you waited this long to call a doctor about it?" She said, "Doctor, up to now we have had use for the eggs."

My friends, apparently you have withdrawn the patient from the doctor. You, too, apparently have decided you need the eggs, because almost everything in the last Congress that you helped those of us from our section of the country to defeat, you now offer in your own name with the freight paid. You want to give away, when there are no takers. You made a cabinet position out of the Federal Security Agency. You have voted unlimited power to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. You have given away the commodities of this country and you have paid the freight on them. There just is not a place where I can see where you have changed the picture that the American people thought you were going to change. You are actually going Truman one better.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I voted for the proposal for wheat to India. Did the gentleman vote for it?

Mr. WHITTEN. I did not.

Mr. HALLECK. Then certainly it does not demonstrate any reversal of my position because I supported that measure.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not mean my statements to be personal. I must say again, I sympathize with my friend from Indiana. I may be wrong but certainly I am consistent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I understood the gentleman from Mississippi was seeking to withdraw his motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. FULTON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I object to the withdrawal of the motion. It has to be done by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, out of the confusion I apparently got 5 minutes I did not expect to get, and I am not sure that I will need to use it all. I am prepared to yield some of it to the majority leader if he wants it.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman that I do not want any of the time. I had trusted that we might vote on the motion and proceed.

Mr. COUDERT. Then I will take it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is in favor of the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is opposed to it.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman is opposed to the motion. The gentleman is going to speak in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I am taking this opportunity to advise the House concerning that amendment because under the motion just adopted, made by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Kansas, debate was sharply limited.

I suppose we have become so accustomed to throwing away the billions of the taxpayers' hard-earned money and to printing money in the Bureau of Engraving that \$100 million is such an insignificant, trifling sum that a few minutes more or less is of no importance. In fact, while we were going through the teller vote, I was trying quickly, with my very limited high-school arithmetic,

to figure out how much we were spending per minute of the \$75 billion we are spending each year, and it took so long I have not gotten to the end. But the fact is we are spending in the millions every minute of every hour. There is no reason in the world why we should be so firm in limitation of debate, when we are dealing with even a mere, insignificant \$100 million.

My amendment will test the sincerity of those who say that this is a famine-relief measure. It is so described in the bill. My amendment will strike out section 2 completely. It will then make it a straight giveaway of the wheat or whatever else may be given away. It will not impose upon the taxpayer the obligation of twice paying for whatever the commodities may be, once when bought by the Commodity Credit Corporation and stored, and the second time when under this bill, under section 2, the Treasury is required to go out and either sell bonds or raise taxes to pay a second time.

In other words, if you vote for this amendment you will strike out the provision that there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums, and so forth. What a joke that is. There are no funds in the Treasury. All the Treasury has is the right to go to the Bureau of Engraving these days and increase the national debt, which we are going to be asked to do in a day or two, I understand.

So I say to you, Mr. Chairman, if you want to make this a giveaway program of surplus commodities, if you want to spare the taxpayer the burden of paying twice for those commodities, if you want to keep down the national debt by \$100 million, you will vote in favor of the amendment to strike out section 2. It will leave to the President the power to dispose of \$100 million worth of commodities in any way that he sees fit but we will not be asked to go through the motions of buying it twice.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I had intended to say when I was speaking before, but my time ran out, that in conversations had with the President and others about this proposed program, it was recognized all around that it might well be that the time would expire, which is provided for here, without the first dollar of the money made available here being used.

Mr. COUDERT. And may I say to the majority leader with respect to that, I am not so sure that the time element is of such very great importance. We are close to the top of the debt limit, and whenever this authority is used, it will mean an increase in the national debt because we are going to be on a deficit financing basis as far as you and I can see ahead.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, would this be the proper time to make a point of order against some wording in section 22?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman to state the point of order.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the point of order comes too late, the section has been read.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We are debating on the whole bill, and I suggest that we do not want to pass a bill without considering every part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Section (2) is now under consideration.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, that is what I want to make my point of order on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the wording beginning on line 24:

Any assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used in advance of such appropriations or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this act.

Mr. Chairman, I make that point of order on the ground that when I offered an amendment authorizing that the \$100 million be taken from funds heretofore appropriated for the Mutual Security Administration, the point of order was sustained that those funds were already appropriated for a specific purpose and that we could not divert such funds. I am making the same point of order now that any assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation which have heretofore been appropriated would be by the same token diverted to this purpose for the use of the Mutual Security Administration. In other words, the situation if this is permitted to stay in the bill would be that we could not divert Mutual Security funds to carry out this, but that we could divert agricultural funds to carry out a mutual-security program.

Before this debate is over, if I still have some time, I am going to point out how the views of the Members of this House or this Committee are entirely—

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri is not addressing himself to the point of order which he raised. I think the gentleman should address himself to the point of order so that the Chair may rule on it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have made the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOPE. I do not think there is any connection or any analogy between the point that the gentleman makes and the point of order which was sustained by the Chair earlier in the day. As

I understand it, that is the only argument which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] makes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] desire to be heard further on this point of order?

Mr. HOPE. As I understand it, the point of order of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] is to the effect that we are diverting an appropriation made to the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is not true. The Commodity Credit Corporation does not get appropriations except as they are made for operating expenses. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to borrow and to give notes for its borrowings. That is its source of funds. We are not dealing here with an appropriation. The only thing we are dealing with is the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation which have been secured by borrowings.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Further against the point of order: the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] contends that this language authorizes them to take funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation and use them for foreign aid. That is no more out of order than it would be to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make its assets and funds available to the school-lunch program or any other program that the Congress sees fit to adopt. It is clearly the purpose of the whole bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to use its assets for certain designated purposes and any purpose that the Congress designates is in order under this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. May we have the point of order read?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the language to which the point of order is raised.

The Clerk read as follows:

Point of order made by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 2, line 24, following the period, strike out the balance of the line, all of line 25, and lines 1 and 2 on page 3.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, is it not the parliamentary situation here that debate has commenced on section 2 at the particular time when the point of order is being made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES]?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that this point of order may be made at any time of the consideration of the section.

The Chair is ready to rule. Since the previous point of order was sustained on similar grounds, the Chair now sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The time will be divided equally among those Members seeking recognition and will be about 1 minute each.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES], a member of the committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am going to use this time to make a statement and I hope the membership will try to follow me and act in a reasonable manner and not try to be guided by the whip and the expediency of this bill.

I realize that what I have done to this bill by my point of order would prevent funds to be taken from the Commodity Credit Corporation for the payment of transfer and transportation of surplus commodities.

I also want to make this statement, and if I am wrong I hope the gentlemen will correct me. During the discussion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], who has proposed one amendment in the committee, and the discussion by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], the gentleman from Iowa expressed the idea and it was his intention at the time the amendment was offered that the \$100 million would include the cost of the commodities and include the cost of distribution; in other words, a total of \$100 million.

When I offered my amendment the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] said that was not the intention of the bill; that the \$100 million was for transportation only and would not restrict the amount of CCC stocks that might be distributed.

With that kind of confusion in this House I say we would be justified in sending this bill back to the committee to be correctly drafted. It would not cause too much delay and we will be here long enough to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 2, line 17, strike out all of section 2.

(Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment concerning which I spoke during the 5 minutes I fortunately got my hands on—5 minutes following the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

This is the amendment that would make it unnecessary for the American taxpayers to pay twice for the gifts of these commodities now in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The point of order raised by the gentleman from Missouri disposed of a portion of this section; my amendment will dispose of the balance; so if you adopt my amendment it will mean that we will give away, honestly and completely give away, these commodities without charging them a second time to the taxpayers. I suggest that those Members who represent taxpayers and consumers bear that in mind.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course the effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to charge this whole proposition to the farm program; and I certainly would not be for that.

Mr. COUDERT. I did not expect the gentleman to be for it or the bill would not be here now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, there has been much talk here today about how to deal with these surpluses in ways that will not be a giveaway program. I am sorry the House Committee on Agriculture did not report out my bill which provides such alternative method. What can we do about the agricultural surpluses? We cannot deny that they exist. There are only two sound things we can do: One is to reduce drastically our production of agricultural commodities. Everyone realizes what a shrinkage that would cause in our whole economy with hardship to every person in the land. The other way is to expand the markets for our farm products, at home and abroad.

I submitted a bill as a second title to the bill before us which would use agricultural surpluses to expand our foreign markets by expanding free world economies by promoting additional trade and strengthening the economies of cooperating nations. It would authorize the President to make agreements with friendly countries to sell surplus commodities for foreign currencies where that can be done without displacing usual markets, at not less than maximum world prices, and where he can use the currencies received to expand production in friendly countries, increase trade between them and between them and ourselves. It would use private trade channels wherever practicable.

The bill in substance was adopted in the conference on the Mutual Security Act. But it is limited there to funds appropriated under that act. The bill was adopted by the Senate yesterday. Unfortunately, the Committee on Agriculture decided not to act upon it at this time and to put it over until next session. It is clear I could not get it adopted here this afternoon after the committee's action. I must express regret that the committee did not adopt this bill as title II and put into operation at once this sensible program to expand economies all around the world on the basis of trade, not aid, and allow the President to sell surpluses instead of giving them away.

When we go back into the House I shall ask to include with my remarks the text of my bill and I hope the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will take action to bring it before the Congress next year.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1953."

SEC. 202. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to use agricultural commodities in excess of market demands to expand free world economies by promoting additional trade and strengthening the economies of cooperating nations.

SEC. 203. Section 550 (b), (c), (d), and (e) of Public Law 118, 83d Congress, 1st session, are incorporated herein. The President is authorized in accordance with these provisions of said section to:

(a) make excess agricultural commodities heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation, available for sale as hereinafter provided, and to deliver such commodities as may be sold at such times, in such quantities, and at such places within the United States, including free on board vessel American ports, as the President may direct; and

(b) direct the Commodity Credit Corporation, from any funds available to it and subject to terms and conditions prescribed by the President and within the limits of funds made available by the Congress for this purpose, to convert into dollars the foreign currencies received by exporters in payment for the sale of excess agricultural commodities which have been sold by exporters.

Provided, That the total value of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks made available under (a) this section shall not exceed \$1 billion: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this section shall be used for the purposes of this title and for section 550 (b), (c), (d), and (e), in lieu of the funds described in section 550 (a) of Public Law 118.

SEC. 204. Excess agricultural commodities shall be those determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of probable domestic and export sales plus a reserve for working stocks.

SEC. 205. The President shall administer the provisions of this title so as to export the maximum quantities of agricultural commodities with the funds made available to him for this purpose.

SEC. 206. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for funds or commodities made available by it to carry out the provisions of title I and title II of this act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder, and expenditures incurred by the Corporation pursuant to the authority of section 203 (6). Any funds or assets available to the Commodity Credit Corporation may be used, in advance of such appropriations or payments, for carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 207. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this act after June 30, 1955.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out for the conference committee that when the bill on page 2, lines 12 and 13, refers to any single country, there probably should be some amendment that we will not have time to offer today, so that the bill refers to the zones of occupied countries, because the language of the bill at present would limit Germany, both East and West Germany, to one amount of \$20 million. This is too limiting a factor under present emergency conditions.

I may say that both the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE],

have endorsed the substance and policy of this program by their comments on the mutual security program on page 7122 of the RECORD of June 9, and page 7123. In fact, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] stated:

When we come back to you sometime next year, as we are almost certain to do, and ask your support for an agricultural relief program because we are going to be faced with gigantic agricultural surpluses, in fact we are now faced with these surplus commodities and we are faced with drought and we are faced with disaster—when we come back—do not say that we did not try to make any effort to dispose of these surpluses because we are trying now to encourage the disposal of these things in a way that will not injure the welfare of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I should like to correct some misconceptions as to what this farm program generally entails. The surplus to the amount of about \$3 billion worth of farm products now in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation is not nearly so serious as a lot of us think. About \$1 billion worth of those products are the normal carryover.

There is another thing. The program has not cost this country \$1. I have it from the Library of Congress that the total cost of the farm program has been in the neighborhood of \$1 billion; that the increase in income taxes paid by the farmers has been almost \$1 billion a year because of the price-support program. In other words the increase in income tax has paid all the so-called loss to the Treasury over and over.

There are one or two more things I wish to make plain. There have been statements on the floor this afternoon that unless this surplus is immediately taken care of the farm price-support program may be discontinued. That is a rash supposition. There is not a single segment of the American people that would dare advocate such a measure.

Never again will the farmer and his family put in long hours to produce their crops only to take them to the local market and, on bended knee, with supplicant tone, beg of the middleman, "Here is the product of my year of toil. Now what will you give me for it?" That time is forever past as far as the American farmer is concerned.

Besides, if it were possible to force the farmer back into that condition of serfdom it would not only break the farmers, it would throw millions of men out of work and it would stop the wheels of nearly every industry in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill, but not because I think it will aid in administering the farm program; not because I think it will make friends and influence people.

I intend to support it for the simple reason that I think it is the right thing to do.

Really, Mr. Chairman, I wish to believe that this is primarily the reason why the President has sent this bill to the House, and I do believe it is the reason that the American people wish to approve.

(Mr. MILLER of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. McCARTHY was given to Mr. MARSHALL.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

(Mr. WHITTEN and Mr. POLK asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. MARSHALL.)

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a rather odd position today. I find myself in an odd position because I have so little confidence in the Department of Agriculture in dealing with agricultural surpluses. In my lifetime the Department of Agriculture, under Republican administrations, has been inept and impractical in handling surpluses. I happen to be one of those who believes that the prosperity of this country was built upon efficiency, know-how, and full production. I believe that when we do some of these other things that we talk about doing that we do affect our whole economy. I believe that we have a tendency to pull down that economy by failing to meet our marketing problems in a constructive way.

Now, what is wrong with having some reserves of our food? What is wrong with that? It is far less costly to have these reserves of food than it is to have periods of scarcity. When commodities are under a price-support program, by and large we increase the consumption of them. Since the Department of Agriculture has been purchasing butter and supporting it at 90 percent of parity, the consumption of butter has been increasing. The consumption of butter dropped when it was not under a price-support program. That is a fact, not a theory.

Now, I have heard during my lifetime a lot of schemes advanced in terms of trying to protect the farmer's income. I was not so very old when we heard about the McNary-Haugen bill, and we heard about the necessity of putting into effect a two-price system. What are we doing with this program? We are putting into effect a two-price system, actually. We are putting our commodities onto the market in a way that people can use those commodities. That is not a hindrance to us, but rather a benefit. We have had a farm program for the last 20 years, a democratic farm program, and never once in those 20 years has a surplus of agricultural products proved to be detrimental. It has really been an asset to this country.

Mr. Chairman, I want to drive home one point and that is that the American people today, the people who work for a living today in America, get more food for less hours of work than they ever have in the history of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that we never in the history of this country and during all of these periods that we have talked about have made as effective use of food as we could in preserving the peace of the world. I am supporting this bill. I am supporting this bill because of what I believe it means to the farmers of this country. I do not propose that the farmers of this country be

placed in a position where the price of their commodities shall continue to go down as it has in the last 6 months because of our inability to recognize the value of an abundance of production. The importance of that production to the welfare of the people living in the cities, on the farms. Our citizens all want peace and security. I believe this program to be toward that end.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

(Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. SUTTON.)

(Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to point out to the Members here that this bill should be recommended, because in no way can this \$100 million be sent to the peoples across the pond now, for, after the point of order was sustained, an appropriation would have to be made before the provisions of the bill would prevail, as a result of which not \$1 of this could be sent to the peoples regardless of whether or not they are starving. Am I not correct, may I ask the chairman of the committee?

Mr. HOPE. The only effect of striking out the language on a point of order is that some other source of funds for the transportation of these commodities would have to be found. Section 1 provides for the use of the commodities. Further, of course, this matter can very easily be taken care of in conference.

Mr. SUTTON. That is a matter that I think should be taken care of in the Committee on Agriculture. I hope when the time comes the bill will be recommended to our committee so that we can work out a bill which someone knows something about, and at the same time make a report available to the Congress so we can read the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before our committee. No one knows what anyone said on this bill except those who were on the Committee on Agriculture. I think that is a bad precedent to set in the House, of not letting the Members know what the witnesses said about the bill. I hope the bill will be recommitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, may I make this observation: It is very easy to be generous and liberal and charitable with the other man's money. We are very liberal with the money of the taxpayers of this Nation. If we as individuals were asked to contribute \$100 apiece to this fund, I wonder how many of us would do it? There is one man out of this crowd—there are two holding up his hand—that would be willing to contribute personally \$100. Instead of that we are voting and taking millions of dollars out of the pockets of the taxpayers without their consent in order for this beneficent purpose to be carried out. It is good, there is no question about that, but I thought it ought to have come out of the appropriation we made to the Mutual Security Admini-

stration program a few days ago. If we had done that, I would have voted for it. When I voted for the MSA bill the other day I thought we had voted for enough foreign aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make one statement: I am in favor of giving these surplus commodities to needy people overseas. We could however in some instances, get foreign currency for them. This would be helpful because we now have to buy such foreign currency with dollars. At least this possibility should be explored especially in view of the fact the testimony before our committee was to the effect that there was no present emergency and none in the foreseeable future. I believe too that this type of program is more properly charged to the Mutual Security Program than to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Because of these objections to the present form of the bill I shall vote to recommit it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to close debate on section 2 of the bill.

(Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. HOPE.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, some people say we are giving away the taxpayers' money, but the people of this country do not want these surplus agricultural commodities to spoil, they do not want us to let them be wasted, they want us to give them to hungry people. I think Americans generally appreciate how fortunate we are to have this great abundance of food and other agricultural products.

There was a Gallup poll published in the papers last Sunday. Perhaps many of you saw it. It was on this very question. This poll was on the President's message without any limitations whatever, and on that poll 72 percent of those who were interrogated said they were in favor of the President's proposal, 20 percent said they were opposed, and 8 percent expressed no opinion. I am sure that is a fair reflection of the sentiment of the people of this country. Let me further state that, in my opinion, the farm program in this country is doomed unless we permit these surpluses that have been piling up under the program to be diverted where they are needed to feed people who are hungry.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to say that I have rarely heard as statesmanlike a statement by any committee chairman as this one. I hope the House will understand we are dealing with substance and not form and that the rigmarole regarding the handling of this money does not alter the fact that food is being spoiled. I think it is the duty of the House and the duty of the President to

find a way to use it and to relieve human distress, and, therefore, those who have spoken for and against the farm program, and who are for this bill I commend in the spirit that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] just stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this act after June 30, 1955.

Committee amendment: On page —, line 4, strike out "June 30, 1955" and insert "March 15, 1954."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on section (3) close in 10 minutes.

Mr. WHEELER. I object.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section (3) close in 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. This is not the time to make such a motion. There has to be at least some debate before such a motion can be made, as I understand the rules. I am only trying to protect Members on this side who want to speak on the bill. I think there ought to be a reasonable time for debate. I am for the bill, but I am trying to protect the Members on this side who want time to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order by the gentleman from Massachusetts is well taken.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I suggest that the gentleman ask unanimous consent that debate close in 20 minutes?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 20 minutes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that in nearly all of these New Deal, Fair Deal, square deal, whatever kind of deal program we have had, one of the distinguishing features of these programs is that every last one of them could be reduced to very short titles. I sought in the committee on yesterday, and have sought today, to amend the title of this bill, which if you will note is rather cumbersome. I sought to amend the title so that it could be kept in line with past performances in the New Deal, Fair Deal traditions. You had your FERA, the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, you had your MSA, your ECA, and all these other alphabetical programs. I have suggested that this rather cumbersome title be amended to read, "The Commodity Relief Administration Program." I realize a great many promises were made last fall, one of which was that shooting would cease in Korea. Just this week those who made that promise succeeded in signing a capitulation in that theater of operations. I pray to God that shooting will continue ceased, and that if it begins again at any time, that those who are

called upon to do the shooting will be given some good purpose for the shooting.

It occurs to me that one of the major reasons for this patricular bill today is that the capitulation having been signed in Korea, you must have additional justification for increasing the national debt limitation under which we are now operating. This is one of many. If you hold this to \$100 million, how can you guarantee to me that after you have fed under this program—fed who?—fed the agrarian reformers in Red China, and under the terms of this bill you can do it, fed the North Koreans who have been killing your boys and the boys of your constituents, and under the terms of this bill you can do it. Let me ask you this: If you send wheat into East Germany to replace the wheat that was taken away from that region by Russia or that was not produced by the imposition of the Communist regime, who in the final analysis are you helping? Are you not also helping the Russians? As I have said earlier today, I cannot support a measure which proposes to further burden the taxpayers of this country to implement and finance a program of feeding the very people who have been killing American men.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Apropos of what the gentleman said, to the effect that delivery of commodities under this legislation could be made in Communist Russia and Communist China, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this question came up during the hearings on the bill, and we asked the State Department to give the committee a letter stating whether or not their interpretation of the bill was such that commodities could be delivered to those countries. I wish to read at this time a direct statement on that point:

If H. R. 6016 is enacted, the administration would interpret the term "friendly country" for the purposes of that act to mean any country other than: (1) the U. S. S. R., or (2) any nation or area dominated or controlled by the foreign government or foreign organization controlling the world Communist movement. In direct answer to Mr. POAGE's question concerning the U. S. S. R., Poland, and Communist China, the Department considers that this interpretation would exclude those countries under present circumstances from participation in any benefits under H. R. 6016.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I made the request a while ago for an additional minute and it was denied. I was told there was no more time.

Mr. WHEELER. I call attention to subsection (2) where it says "to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government."

[Mr. ABERNETHY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Mr. SUTTON was given to Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, it will come as a surprise to no one in this House to learn that I am opposed to this legislation.

I remember back in the last Congress I had occasion to meet many times with our great Republican leaders in the House in informal conferences. There we planned, and successfully, the death of the Fair Deal in the 81st and 82d Congresses. Oh, I remember how our Republican friends would say to me that if it were not for that great coalition of conservative southern Democrats and those good old bedrock Midwest Republicans, the Truman Democratic crowd would have long since spent this country into bankruptcy.

I remember how you good Republicans said that we just had to do something to get rid of these spenders if the country were to survive. For 6 years, I labored under the delusion that the Republicans were serious about that, that they really wanted to get rid of the spenders.

Well, I have had a lot of truths revealed to me in the last 6 months. I have learned a lot. It was not the spenders you wanted to get rid of, it was the Democratic spenders. Now that it is the Republican spenders who are in power, you find no fault with it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman persist in refusing to pay any attention to the fact that \$14 billion have been cut off of the Truman estimated budget in this session alone?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. No; and I am also aware of the fact that \$14 billion are available for overseas expenditures next year, too, made so by the present Republican majority at the request of the present Republican President.

I do not have any fault to find with our good President. I think he is a great man. As a matter of fact, several years ago I advocated him for President on the Democratic Party platform. He would have made a good Democratic President, with southern Democrats to keep him in line.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And probably he will be on your platform next time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi moves that the Committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have no fault to find with our great and noble President. It is not his fault that he cannot see the rest of the country; there is too much Dewey in his eyes.

You got rid of the Democratic spenders, you got rid of Mr. Truman. Sometimes my conscience is moved when I reflect upon some of the things I used to say about the gentleman from Missouri. Of course, I do not take any of it back, but when you put it on a basis of comparison with what we have got today, perhaps I should apologize to him. He was a piker when it came to spending—in comparison with you fellows.

A few minutes ago, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITEN], in speaking to my Republican friends, admonished them about standing by their conscientious beliefs. He wanted to know where the good Republicans of the 82d Congress and the 81st Congress happened to be when these Fair Deal-left wing-giveaway measures are brought before the House of Representatives. Why, you would not have believed it if, in the 82d Congress—I would have said it could never happen. So help me, its true. I witnessed our distinguished majority leader walking up and down the aisle cracking that big whip, and even the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, a veritable rock of Gibraltar, rolled down the aisle and through the teller line in opposition to cutting appropriations for foreign aid. He has opposed foreign aid, until his party came into power. Unbelievable? Yes, but true, nevertheless.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is a good old black snake. It has a good, sharp cracker on the end. I know.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, I recognize the fact that I have opposed my leadership many times. My anti-Fair Deal vote is even better than yours is. I have a poor record of supporting this administration, too. Why? Because it has been presenting the very same stuff that Mr. Truman was trying to cram down our throats. You Republicans went further than Truman; you did not even candy-coat it. Why, in all of the wildest days of the Democratic Party during the last 20 years—and they had some wild ones—they never conceived the idea of taking our surplus produce that we had paid for in price

supports and giving it to foreigners. Somebody said that Mr. Brannan said we ought to take it and give it to the American people, and you hollered "socialism." You screamed "socialism" and so did I, and I would scream it again if you tried to do it now. Well, apparently it is not socialism to give it to foreigners. In my book it is just plain downright foolishness; an utter disregard for the welfare of our people.

Now, I have opposed my leadership many, many times, and they did not like it. But they never questioned my right to vote my convictions on any legislation. Surely, under our concept of government, you should vote according to the way that you believe it will serve the best interest of this country—not because the President advocated it or because your party favors it. There should be no reason except that you yourself, in your own mind and according to your own conscience, believe it to be in the best interest of the general welfare of the people of the United States. My commission that entitles me to a seat in Congress reads exactly the same as any other Member of this House. It reads "Elected as a Member of the 83d Congress." The commission that the distinguished majority leader serves under reads the same way. It does not say "Majority leader." Your commission reads the same way. All of us take the same oath of office. It is our individual responsibility to vote as we believe, without being influenced by party considerations, or intimidated by political pressures.

In other words, our consciences should be our guide. Had our people wanted us to vote a rubber-stamp vote for our parties, they would have empowered our party leaders to cast our votes for us, and thus save the expense of our salaries.

With me, as with most Representatives from the South, the country's welfare is paramount to that of the party.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. Chairman, we are rapidly coming to the end of the consideration of this measure. I do not care to discuss further with my very good friend from Mississippi his castigation of some of us on this side for what he believes to be our misdoings. I am very sorry that he does not approve of what we are doing, but I would not want him to leave even the implication that he has any higher regard for the welfare of this country than I have or a lot of the rest of us over here. The gentleman has no monopoly on that score.

It so happens that there are Republicans over here who have never believed in anything like military aid abroad. I was here before the gentleman came here, back before Pearl Harbor, and we had great questions that involved the country and the Congress and what we ought to do about those questions; and I have been on hand since that time. I was here in the 80th Congress. I supported the interim aid to France and Italy and the Greece-Turkey aid. I do not think there is anyone here who will

deny that much of that program has turned out to be very good.

It fell to my lot as majority leader of the Republican 80th Congress to respond to what most people seem to think was something in the best interests of this country, to bring about the enactment of the Marshall plan. There were some on that side who were opposed to it then and some on this side who were opposed to it, but I never heard anyone challenge the patriotism or the integrity of anyone as the result of that vote.

I mention these things only to point out that when my friend undertakes to establish that there has been some great change come over the Republican Party it just is not true. There has been a very substantial change in the attitude of the Government, and he should be applauding it instead of finding fault and criticizing. We are not being bedeviled with a lot of socialistic proposals that you and I both have opposed and which I still oppose. And may I say I do not need to worry so much about my opposition now because such proposals are not forthcoming from this new Republican administration.

Getting back to the measure that is before us, we have these commodities. If the American people do not already know that we have a lot of surpluses piled up, even of cotton and some other things, they are certainly going to find it out pretty quickly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There will be no cotton shipped under this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know whether there will be cotton shipped or not, but what I said about the surplus of cotton is true. We have lots of surpluses.

May I say again, I think the President of the United States has established definitely in the 6 months he has been in office that he is as careful of the taxpayers' dollar as anyone of us here.

That being true, whether or not any of this authority will be exercised I do not know, but as far as I am concerned a lot of these things have been doing a lot of good and are beginning to show results. This is no departure from the positions I have taken before because, as I pointed out, I voted for the wheat for India and I think it was a good thing we enacted that law, and I supported the wheat for Pakistan.

As far as I am concerned, we have these goods. It is not going to wreck the farm program because the impact will not be on the farm program. Of course, \$100 million of surplus commodities is only a small dent in a \$3 billion valued surplus, but it is something. Beyond all of that, I think it is a great weapon to be judiciously used by a patriotic President of the United States in supporting our position in the world and at the same time doing those things that are deemed to be in the self-interest and best interest of the United States of America.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed out of order and revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill because I believe we cannot fight communism as an idea with bullets and the atomic bomb. I have an idea that we might win the fight against communism with food and with the other moral and spiritual resources that are at the command of the American people.

But, Mr. Chairman, what I rose to say is this: Early this afternoon when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was speaking on a point of personal privilege, and was having a colloquy with the distinguished majority leader, I wanted to rise to defend the chairman on one of the charges made against him but I did not do so because I did not want to seem to be taking sides in the argument between the chairman of that great Committee on Government Operations and the members of the committee. And now I am not taking sides. But I do want to refute the charge that he is discourteous to members of his committee. I first came to the Congress in the 80th Congress, when the gentleman from Michigan was chairman of that great committee.

He was not only courteous to the freshmen members of that committee—he was most kind and helpful. It was his custom to begin the interrogation of witnesses with the lowest-ranking member of the minority party of which I was a member. He then proceeded with the lowest-ranking man on the majority side, and so on until he reached the highest ranking member of his own party. This is and was exactly opposite to the usual practice of committee chairmen in the questioning of witnesses.

Sometimes the gentleman from Michigan is blunt and abrupt but never discourteous.

Moreover, I have never heard him question the integrity or sincerity of another member. He is a man of strong convictions with the ability to state them forcefully and interestingly. I often disagree with him, but I respect his views and his courage in fighting for them. One is never in the dark as to his stand on questions that come before the House.

[Mr. HAYS of Ohio's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DORN of South Carolina moves that the Committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time since the 80th Congress that I have ever resorted to this method to obtain the floor. Yesterday on the Truman-Celler bill I finally got 1 minute. We are not being given time to debate these important measures. I have a letter here that I want the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota to hear, if he is still on the floor because I remember my good friend, during the debate on the Pakistan grain bill saying that the people who needed it would get it, and he made a point against my argument that the Red Cross could aid and assist the Government of Pakistan and to supervise in the distribution of this grain.

I have a letter here to a Member of this House from a resident of Pakistan, a resident for a number of years. I am sorry I cannot disclose his name because I am sure he would be punished by certain people interested in helping this foreign WPA. I am going to read a part of it. He said:

It is very nice on the part of your people to give this 1 million tons of wheat to Pakistan, but actually Pakistan did not need the wheat as badly as it was advertised in the papers. It has been a great political stunt.

There is still plenty of wheat hoarded by the big landlords who the government is too shy to touch. Even the so-called wheat-procurement plan is doomed to failure, for the same reason.

When the States agreed to give this 1 million tons of wheat, it should have imposed the condition that this wheat should be distributed to the needy by some agency such as Red Cross or the like, and should have never been given to the government which is the government of the landlords. The government will never distribute any part of the wheat free, but will sell it at the prevailing prices, and the poor who are meant to be benefited by this generous gesture of your country will not benefit by it at all.

There is actually no famine in the country, but a manmade one.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There are two things to say in reply. First, are we to take the judgment of this individual, unknown to us, or the judgment of a good many Members of Congress who were there this spring, and our own representatives over there, and the dean of agriculture at Purdue University, who was sent over with one of the leading agricultural economists of this country, to examine the situation? They went into the fields. They saw in person the starving cattle and the hungry people.

All of us reported that the famine is not acute now but it will be acute in the winter, because then the harvest, which is just now in, will be gone. There will not be enough grain to go beyond the fall.

The second thing to say is that when the first interim relief program came up, many of us had this same idea of sending the food or grain over and hav-

ing it distributed through private agencies like the Red Cross. Former President Hoover was sent by President Truman to Germany shortly after V-E Day, to look into that situation—and nobody knows more about that kind of situation than Herbert Hoover. On his return he told our committee that in his judgment it could not be handled through private agencies. It had to be done by putting our grain in with the grain of that country and having both handled through the regular rationing system of the country.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know what happened before the gentleman's Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I do know what was said about the Pakistan famine, and that was not said until after Mr. Dulles and Governor Stassen had spent 3 short days in Pakistan, and they did not give us, before our committee, any evidence to the effect that anybody was starving.

Mr. JUDD. These men were sent out from Purdue University before Secretary Dulles and Mr. Stassen went over there. And we had issued our report before that.

Mr. COOLEY. We only got the report about the Pakistan wheat situation after Secretary Dulles returned home.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have completed only about a third of my statement, and I shall have to decline to yield further.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that many of us have been to Pakistan. I was in Pakistan with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. We saw a ship there 20 months ago, being loaded with wheat for Red Russia. It was the same ship, the *Batory*, the captain of which recently fled to England. We did not see any famine there then.

Mr. JUDD. There was not any famine then.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I agree with the writer of this letter that it is a manmade famine and a fraud upon the people of the United States, and I also believe that it will aid the Communist cause. I should like to answer the point that the gentleman made. It will aid communism, in that the poor people in Pakistan seeing these landlords selling the wheat from America at an enormous profit will move just a little bit closer toward the Communist cause. I oppose this bill for the same reason. These surplus commodities will not reach the people in need. Instead of winning friends for America, we will lose people who have been friendly in the past. UNRRA made enemies for America and largely aided the rapid spread of communism. Col. Jan Bukar, of Slovakia, stated before a great committee of this House on May 14, 1953:

I have no further remarks, but I want again to state that through UNRRA the Communist Party gained many members.

Yesterday the majority party took up a bill from the Democratic Party platform—the Truman-Celler bill—and passed it with New Deal support. To-

day the majority party goes a little further to the left and takes up the old Henry Wallace plan of throwing and giving away surplus products. Henry Wallace had us in ragged clothes, plowing up cotton, and killing pigs, and then he was back in a few years begging us to grow more food and meat for the war effort. In a short while you will be back wishing you had these goods and pleading with the farmers to produce more food.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOPE. I shall not need 5 minutes. I ask for a vote on the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DORN of South Carolina) there were—ayes 33, noes 123.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to impose my views upon the House at this time, yet as one member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I would like to speak briefly on the pending bill.

As the debate began there was only one point I wanted to be clear on and that was whether or not the fiscal condition of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be impaired. I am convinced that it would not be impaired.

For 8 years I sat on the Committee on Banking and Currency. My friends on the Committee on Agriculture know that I was always on their side in the struggle to keep the financial structure of that organization strong.

In the light of facts developed today there ought to be no question as to our course. The need is great, the power to alleviate it is in our hands. I remind the House that one-half of all the people in the world will go to bed hungry tonight. When that is contrasted with the tremendous productivity of our own Nation, with billions of dollars worth of food in storage, some of which will spoil if not distributed abroad, the answer is clear. The program of the Commodity Credit Corporation is not impaired. We are in danger of becoming defeatists if we allow fears as to our capacity to provide food to make us reluctant to follow this thoroughly sound plan.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], whose leadership we all respect insists that the committee heard no proof that there are at present emergency needs for the food. I presume he has in mind evidence submitted by the departments, but private organizations, notably CARE officials, did present strong evidence as to the urgency of some areas right now. And with the general conditions I referred to, the

whim of nature abetted by instable conditions may produce famine almost anywhere. The bill should be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Dowdy yielded his time to Mr. COOLEY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from Arkansas would not yield. He made a desperate plea here about the great need. The fact is that before our committee the State Department and every other department of Government that appeared there said positively and specifically that they knew of no place in the world where this money was needed today, and they were only preparing for some emergency which might hereafter arise.

I challenge the chairman of our committee or any other member of the committee to deny that this is the testimony that was offered to the House Committee on Agriculture.

I went before the Rules Committee and appeared in opposition to the rule and stated at the time that we were told that there was no place under the sun where this money was needed today or where it would be needed tomorrow; yet we hear these great pleas today in the name of humanity. There is no question of humanity involved here. I do not want the House to be led into believing that there is any need anywhere for this money or these commodities at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have been giving away the substance and the money of the people of this country for a long, long time. I remember back in 1946 or 1947 when \$90 million was made available to Poland, already behind the Iron Curtain, and the Dean Acheson law firm collected some \$90,000 for allegedly negotiating that so-called loan that will never be paid back to this country. And what have we obtained from that \$90 million that was handed over to Poland? Yes; we have been giving away the substance of the people of this country for a long time and in this bill we are continuing giveaway today to the tune of \$100 million.

I am opposed to this bill because it represents the worst kind of blank-check spending, the same kind of blank-check spending I opposed under the Truman administration, and will continue to oppose as long as I am in Congress under any President of the United States.

Let us be specific about what we are going to spend money for from here on out, and no matter how thin the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture slices it, there is no prohibition whatever in this bill against sending surplus commodities to any country back of the Iron Curtain. It is only necessary to say that there are some people in an

Iron Curtain country who are "friendly" and in "need." It makes no difference how tyrannical their government or whether they have contributed, directly or indirectly, to the killing of American boys in Korea.

Of course there are agricultural surpluses in this country that need to be disposed of. But this is a fantastic way of solving the problem of surpluses. Has this administration and the Committee on Agriculture no better way of facing up to this problem than to continue the vicious circle of permitting farmers and consumers to be victimized at the market places and again in taxes to finance giveaways such as this to foreigners whose ingratitude is all too often readily apparent?

This is another step along the road to destruction of this Republic. I refuse to go along.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

(Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I really was going to discuss another matter in the short time allotted me, however I cannot let my friend from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] get by with that attack on the Secretary of Agriculture and his future plans for the Department of Agriculture. I should think the gentleman from Ohio would have the good grace after the past performances of the Department of Agriculture under a Democratic administration to refrain from criticizing any program that the Secretary may propose, because if he or anybody in the Department can conceive any ideas or crackpot programs such as have been perpetrated and crammed down the throats of the American people during the last 20 years, I would like to hear it.

All my friend from Ohio has to do is to recall a few years of the programs of converting the young hogs into fertilizer, distributing the fertilizer to the farmer to increase the yield and production to be plowed under. The former administration was dug in for 20 years and their programs of putting three or four billion dollars of foodstuffs in warehouses and storage to rot and waste is nothing to cheer about. Secretary Benson cannot undo in a few months the difficult problems he inherited. It takes courage to face the task he has before him and I know he will turn in a fine performance. Leave him alone. Criticism at this time is unjustified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. MCCARTHY addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I dislike finding myself in disagreement with the majority of the Members of my party on my committee. I can appreciate their concern about using a foreign-aid program as a price-support operation. If I thought this would do that I would certainly be against this bill. But we are up against a practical situation. We have over \$2 billion worth of commodities that have accumulated in the warehouses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. We are engaged in a worldwide fight against communism. To wage that fight we have appropriated billions of dollars during the past few years. The ranking member of my committee on my side of the aisle has said that there is no need for this legislation. The answer to that is that, if a need should arise during the next few months, the President should have the power to meet the emergency. If no need develops, no harm will be done, because no action will be taken under the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am against this bill, but I am surprised to seemingly be aligned with many high support price Members who have in the past been principally responsible for the situation which has prompted a thing like this to come to the Committee on Agriculture, because the motive back of this on the part of the Committee on Agriculture was definitely a relief of the farm program. Those of you who listened to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] will agree with him that the farm program is in trouble. It is in dire trouble because of the illogical interference with the free economy that we should have had in this country in the past, and because of the building up of surpluses we recognize the only method of disposal of it is as a gift and at a cost probably of \$5 billion. The high support price farm program is in trouble; it is in dire trouble, and within the next year you will find the people and the taxpayers of this country awakening to kill it.

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to Mr. RAYBURN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to speak on the pending bill or the amendment, but many Members would like to know if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] will let us know what we may expect for the remainder of the day.

Mr. HALLECK. I will be glad to tell the gentleman as nearly as I can. As soon as we dispose of this bill the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary wants to send the emergency immigration bill to conference. The conference report on the Continental Shelf bill has been filed. I hope that we can get that up this evening. I understand the chairman has had some consultation with the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I am informed by the leader in the other body

that he would like to have that conference report sent over there so they can vote on it at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. RAYBURN. I understand also that that will take very little time.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. The gentleman from Michigan has a bill; I do not know just what it is, but as I understand he has talked to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], and that the bill likely can be called under unanimous consent. I think it is the so-called wheat-agreement bill. I think there is agreement on it in the Committee on Banking and Currency. There is a deadline on that, and I think that can be disposed of. We had been hoping to call this evening the bill having to do with amending the Natural Gas Act, which as I understand, involves the delineation of authority between State regulatory authorities and the Federal authorities. I might inquire if the gentleman from California would call that up tomorrow.

Mr. HINSHAW. Not this evening, unless there is a short session, because I understand a half hour would be used in opposition to the bill. It will only take 2 minutes otherwise.

Mr. HALLECK. Can the gentleman from Texas advise me as to how much time might be consumed? It has been on the calendar for a number of days, and I had hoped we could dispose of it.

Mr. RAYBURN. My understanding is that this side will use all of the time allotted, 30 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I think also the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has some bills which can be handled by unanimous consent under arrangements which I assume have been worked out with the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RAYBURN. Well, we might expect that the bill in which the gentleman from California is interested will not come up today.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. We will try to get it on tomorrow. I might say to the gentleman that we propose to come in at 11 o'clock tomorrow. A rule has been granted on the so-called judgeship bill and we hope to get it on tomorrow.

There has been interest expressed in the Eklutna, Alaska, project, a measure from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. I think probably we can dispose of these matters tomorrow if we work at them diligently. I might say to the membership generally as things are working out now the goal that we have set for adjournment at the end of the week is very definitely in sight.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] to close debate.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HALLECK] having assumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6016) to authorize the Commod-

ity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements in countries friendly to the United States, pursuant to House Resolution 359, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SUTTON. Bitterly opposed, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then apparently the gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SUTTON moves that the bill H. R. 6016 be recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 82, nays 321, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—82

Abernethy	Fisher	Pilcher
Alexander	Forrester	Poage
Andrews	Fountain	Preston
Ashmore	Frazier	Priest
Bailey	Gentry	Rayburn
Barden	Grant	Regan
Battle	Gross	Robeson, Va.
Bishop	Harris	Rogers, Fla.
Bonner	Herlong	Rogers, Tex.
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Selden
Brooks, Tex.	Ikard	Sheppard
Brown, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Shuford
Burleson	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Ill.
Byrd	Kearns	Smith, Miss.
Camp	King, Pa.	Steed
Cannon	Landrum	Sutton
Carlyle	Long	Teague
Clardy	Lucas	Thomas
Colmer	McMillan	Thompson, La.
Cooley	Mason	Wheeler
Cooper	Matthews	Whitten
Coudert	Mills	Williams, Miss.
Davis, Ga.	Moulder	Willis
Davis, Tenn.	Murray	Wilson, Ind.
Deane	Norrell	Wilson, Tex.
Dorn, S.C.	Passman	Winstead
Dowdy	Patman	
Eberhart	Patten	

NAYS—321

Abbitt	Allen, Calif.	Andresen
Adair	Allen, Ill.	August H.
Addonizio	Andersen,	Angell
Albert	H. Carl	Arends

Aspinall	Granahan	Nicholson
Auchincloss	Green	Norblad
Ayres	Gregory	O'Brien, Ill.
Baker	Gubser	O'Brien, Mich.
Barrett	Gwinn	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates	Hagen, Calif.	O'Hara, Ill.
Beamer	Hagen, Minn.	O'Konski
Becker	Hale	O'Neill
Belcher	Haley	Osmers
Bender	Halleck	Ostertag
Bennett, Fla.	Harden	Patterson
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	Pelly
Bentley	Harrison, Nebr.	Perkins
Bentzen	Harrison, Va.	Pfost
Berry	Harrison, Wyo.	Philbin
Betts	Hart	Pillion
Biatnik	Harvey	Poff
Boggs	Hays, Ark.	Polk
Boland	Hays, Ohio	Price
Bolling	Heller	Prouty
Bolton,	Heseltan	Rabaut
Oliver P.	Hess	Radwan
Bonin	Hiestand	Rains
Bosch	Hill	Ray
Bow	Hillelson	Reams
Bowler	Hillings	Reece, Tenn.
Bramblett	Hoever	Reed, N. Y.
Bray	Hoffman, Ill.	Rees, Kans.
Brooks, La.	Holifield	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brown, Ohio	Holmes	Rhodes, Pa.
Brownson	Holt	Richards
Broyhill	Holtzman	Riehlman
Buchanan	Hope	Riley
Budge	Horan	Rivers
Burdick	Hosmer	Roberts
Busbey	Howell	Robson, Ky.
Byrnc, Pa.	Hruska	Rodino
Byrnes, Wis.	Hunter	Rogers, Colo.
Campbell	Hyde	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Jackson	Rooney
Carnahan	James	Roosevelt
Carrigg	Jarman	Sadlak
Case	Javits	St. George
Cederberg	Jenkins	Saylor
Celler	Jensen	Scherer
Chelf	Johnson	Scott
Chenoweth	Jonas, Ill.	Scrivner
Chiperfield	Jonas, N. C.	Scudder
Chudoff	Jones, Ala.	Secrest
Church	Judd	Seely-Brown
Cicvenger	Karsten, Mo.	Shafer
Cole, Mo.	Kcan	Sheehan
Cole, N. Y.	Keating	Shelley
Condon	Kee	Short
Coon	Kelley, Pa.	Sieminski
Corbett	Kelly, N. Y.	Sikes
Cotton	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Cretella	Kersten, Wis.	Small
Crosser	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Crumpacker	King, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	Kirwan	Smith, Wis.
Curtis, Mass.	Klein	Spence
Curtis, Mo.	Kluczynski	Springer
Curtis, Nebr.	Knox	Staggers
Dague	Krueger	Stauffer
Davis, Wis.	Laird	Stringfellow
Dawson, Ill.	Lane	Sullivan
Dawson, Utah	Lanham	Taber
Delaney	Lantaff	Talle
Dempsey	Latham	Thompson,
Derounian	LeCompte	Mich.
Devereux	Lesinski	Thompson, Tex.
D'Ewart	Lovre	Thornberry
Dodd	McCarthy	Tollefson
Dollinger	McCormack	Trimble
Dondero	McCulloch	Tuck
Donohue	McDonough	Utt
Donovan	McGregor	Van Pelt
Dorn, N. Y.	McIntire	Van Zandt
Doyle	Machrowicz	Velde
Durham	Mack, Ill.	Vorys
Edmondson	Mack, Wash.	Vursell
Elliott	Madden	Wainwright
Ellsworth	Magnuson	Walter
Engle	Mahon	Wampler
Ewins	Mailliard	Warburton
Feighan	Marshall	Weichel
Fenton	Meador	Westland
Fernandez	Merrill	Wharton
Fine	Morrow	Wickersham
Fino	Metcalf	Widnall
Forand	Miller, Calif.	Wier
Ford	Miller, Kans.	Wigglesworth
Frelinghuysen	Miller, Md.	Williams, N.Y.
Friedel	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Calif.
Fulton	Miller, N. Y.	Withrow
Gamble	Molohan	Wolcott
Garmatz	Morano	Wolverton
Gary	Morgan	Yates
Gathings	Morrison	Yorty
Gavin	Moss	Young
George	Multer	Younger
Golden	Mumma	Zablocki
Goodwin	Neal	
Graham	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—28

Bolton,	Gordon	Oakman
Frances P.	Hand	O'Hara, Minn.
Buckley	Hébert	Phillips
Bush	Hinshaw	Powell
Chatham	Kearney	Reed, Ill.
Dies	Kilday	Schenck
Dingell	Lyle	Taylor
Dolliver	McConnell	Vinson
Fallon	McVey	Watts
Fogarty	Martin, Iowa	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dies for, with Mr. Gordon against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Frances P. Bolton with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Fogarty.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Chatham.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Lyle.
Mr. Schenck with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Hand with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Kilday.
Mr. Bush with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. McConnell with Mr. Powell.

Mr. McCARTHY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the motion to recommit the bill, H. R. 6016, for the reason I think the bill could have been improved. However, if a roll-call had been had on the passage of the bill, I would have voted for its passage.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine and relief requirements.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, might I ask the gentleman from Kansas if he proposes to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill?

Mr. HOPE. I propose to offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substitute the House bill as passed.

Mr. SUTTON. And have it sent to conference?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2249 and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 6016 as agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 6016 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On July 27, 1953:

H. R. 2392. An act for the relief of Lee Kwang Nong (George Clifford Roeder).

On July 28, 1953:

H. R. 674. An act for the relief of Irene F. M. Boyle;

H. R. 781. An act for the relief of Johanna C. Willemsen;

H. R. 892. An act for the relief of Betty Robertson and Irene Robertson;

H. R. 947. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Tom Gwin a patent-in-fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 978. An act for the relief of Harue Fukushi;

H. R. 1070. An act to amend title 28, United States Code;

H. R. 1106. An act for the relief of Hanelore Mayeri Fulbright;

H. R. 1308. An act to amend the Color of Title Act;

H. R. 1330. An act for the relief of Mrs. Liane Lieu and her son, Peter Lieu;

H. R. 2779. An act to provide for perfecting the title of C. A. Lundy to certain lands in the State of California heretofore patented by the United States;

H. R. 3581. An act to further the policy enunciated in the act of October 26, 1949 (63 Stat. 927), to facilitate public participation in the preservation of sites, buildings, and objects of national significance or interest by providing for a National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States;

H. R. 3670. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Gamroth;

H. R. 4110. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Weir;

H. R. 4302. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the State of Michigan, acting through the International Bridge Authority of Michigan, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto, across the St. Marys River, from a point in or near the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to a point in the Province of Ontario, Canada," approved December 16, 1940;

H. R. 5227. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5228. An act to amend section 303 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23).

On July 29, 1953:

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Tien Koo Chen.

H. R. 779. An act for the relief of Ida Baghdassarlian;

H. R. 819. An act for the relief of Monika Klein;

H. R. 820. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pia Biondi;

H. R. 847. An act for the relief of Robert J. Rickards, Conception Sotoio Rickards, and Walter John Rickards;

H. R. 1143. An act for the relief of Mary Francina Marconi, Fernanda Guzzi, Anna Ferraro, Mary Laudano, and Julia Pisano;

H. R. 1211. An act for the relief of Isak Benmuvhar;

H. R. 1886. An act for the relief of Paul Myung Ha Chung;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of Ciemin-tina-Ferrara, Maria Garofalo, Rosetta Savino, Maria Serra, Albina Zamunner, and Fedora Gazzarrini;

H. R. 2506. An act for the relief of certain members of the Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart;

H. R. 2652. An act for the relief of Constance Brouwer Scheffer;

H. R. 2787. An act for the relief of Josefine Hoorn (Dmytruk);

H. R. 5238. An act for the relief of Franciszek Jarecki; and

H. J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to permit the entry of 500 eligible orphans under 10 years of age, adopted abroad or to be adopted in the United States by United States citizens serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces or employed abroad by the United States Government.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6481. An act to authorize the issuance of 217,000 special quota immigrant visas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. McCARRAN, and Mr. KILGORE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2277. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of Italy and a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France; and

S. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5805. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and the judiciary branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to

the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MUNDT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CHAVEZ to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2828) entitled "An act to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. SMATHERS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5969) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 2, 27, and 29, to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5728) entitled "An act to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendment to the above-entitled bill and requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and appoints Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. IVES, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. DOUGLAS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5141) entitled "An act to create the Small Business Administration and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise."

EMERGENCY IMMIGRATION PROGRAM

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6481) to authorize the issuance of 240,000 special quota immigrant visas, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the follow-

13. COTTON ALLOTMENTS. The "Daily Digest" states: The Agriculture Committee agreed on a bill on national apportionment for 1954 cotton acreage allotments (H.R. 6665), setting the national minimum allotment at 22.5 million acres. Also agreed to provisions to take care of hardship cases; regarding land factor and history; that there would be no reduction below 70.5%, 1952 acreage, which means that no State would have to take a reduction of more than 29.5% of the 1952 acreage; and that California and Arizona would receive a bonus acreage, over and above their share in the 22.5 million acres, which will not count in the cotton history in such States (p. D816). Rep. Wickersham commented on this proposed bill (p. 10839).
14. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Bow spoke against Federal construction of a dam at Hells Canyon (pp. 10840-42).
15. RESEARCH. Received a Michigan Academy of Science, Arts and Letters petition requesting an increase in the National Science Foundation apropriation (p. 10853).

SENATE

16. FAMINE RELIEF. Conferees were appointed in both Houses on S. 2249, to authorize CCC to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the U.S. (pp. 10720, 10805).
17. DEBT INCREASE. Both Houses received the President's message recommending an increase of \$15,000,000,000 in the statutory debt limit (H. Doc. 220) (pp. 10826-7 10873). Rep. Reed, N. Y., inserted a statement presented by the Administration in support of the increase (pp. 10827-8).
18. FOREST LOANS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment S. 2069, to authorize national banking associations to make loans on forest tracts (S. Rept. 731) (p. 10883).
19. PENALTY MAIL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H.R. 6281, to reimburse the Post Office Department for the transmission of official Government mail matter (S. Rept. 732) (p. 10883).
20. LAND TRANSFERS. Passed without amendment H.R. 3107 and H.R. 2458; to convey certain national-forest lands in Basalt, Colo., and Cherry Point, N. C. (p. 10734). These bills will now be sent to the President.
21. SUBMERGED LANDS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5134, providing for U. S. jurisdiction over submerged lands in the outer continental shelf (pp. 10720-1, 10734-9, 10742-6, 10859-61, 10864-72). This bill will now be sent to the President.
22. PERSONNEL. Passed without amendment H. R. 6185, to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (pp. 10876-7). This bill provides that veterans must receive passing grades in civil service examinations before they may receive credit for preference points; and that before an eligible entitled to 10 points preference may be placed on the top of the register, he must have at least a compensable disability of 10%.

Sen. Carlson spoke on the steps taken during the last six months to strengthen the civil-service system, and he inserted Mr. George H. Moore's (member, CSC) statement on this matter (pp. 10721-2).

- 4-
23. FORESTRY. Sen. Maybank discussed the history and growth of the timber industry in the South (pp. 10861-4).
24. RECLAMATION. Received Interior's report on a plan of improvement for the Washita River Subbasin, Red River Basin, Okla. and Tex.; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 10701).
25. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 6200, the supplemental appropriation bill for 1954 (pp. 10703-20). Sens. Bridges, Ferguson, Cordon, Saltonstall, Hayden, Russell and McCarran were appointed conferees (p. 10720). Agreed to all Committee amendments with one exception not affecting this Department (pp. 10703-6).
- By Sen. Young, to provide an additional \$4,500,000 to this Department to carry out the corn-acreage allotment program (pp. 10713-4).
- By Sen. Bridges, to provide \$84,500,000 for school construction in Federally affected areas, to be effective only upon enactment of H. R. 6049 (pp. 10707-8).
- By Sen. Bridges, to earmark not to exceed \$200,000,000 of Defense Department funds, which are certified by the Defense Secretary as saved as a result of the Korean armistice, for relief and rehabilitation in Korea (pp. 10708-10).
- By Sen. Bridges, to provide \$4,000,000 to carry out an emergency refugee program, to be effective only upon the enactment of either S. 1917 or H. R. 6481 (p. 10711).
- By Sen. Bridges, to provide an additional \$250,000 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (p. 10712).
- By Sen. Bridges, to authorize 215 super-grade positions in the Defense Department (p. 10712).
- By Sen. Fulbright, authorizing contracts in excess of 1 year with respect to certain foreign credits to insure that the agreements under the International Information and Educational activities will be unaffected by the bringing of foreign currencies under the appropriation procedure (pp. 10719-20).
- By Sen. Hayden, providing \$450,000 additional for the Mexican farm-labor program (p. 10718).
- By Sen. Ferguson, permitting use of funds for Council of Economic Advisers' members appointed during recess (p. 10718).
- By Sens. Maybank and Mundt, barring use of funds for new furniture in Government departments if excess or rehabilitation furniture is available (p. 10711).

BILLS INTRODUCED

26. PERSONNEL. S. 2530, by Sen. Douglas, to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment insurance for Federal civilian employees; to Finance Committee (p. 10702).
- S. 2533, by Sen. Mansfield, to provide a lump-sum death payment to beneficiaries of employees of the Forest Service killed while combating forest fires; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee (p. 10702).
- H. R. 6663, by Rep. Friedel, to increase the amount of earnings allowed social-security beneficiaries; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 10852).
- H. R. 6664, by Rep. Heller, to extend and improve the old-age and survivors insurance system, to provide permanent and total disability insurance and rehabilitation benefits; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 10852).
27. CCC. S. 2526, by Sen. Butler, Neb., to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee (p. 10702).

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] yield some time to me so that I may yield the gentlewoman from Idaho a minute?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

(Mrs. PFOST asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it appears certain that this Congress will adjourn without passing any legislation to give relief to the Nation's lead-zinc industry, now in one of the gravest crises in its history. By its overwhelming defeat of the sliding-scale import tax last week, the House turned a deaf and unsympathetic ear on the urgent and rapidly expanding problem of mine shutdown and unemployment in the industry. Already this problem has reached the proportions of an economic tragedy which threatens the entire small and marginal mining operations in the lead-zinc field.

Because I feel our domestic mining industry deserves better treatment—a better deal—I am today introducing a bill which provides another approach to aid for our ailing lead-zinc industry, and would, at the same time, open up an umbrella under which other metals could come, should they get into similar trouble.

It is a companion bill to one already introduced in the Senate by that great friend of mining, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, and calls for the establishment of an incentive payment plan as a means of encouraging exploration, production and conservation of domestic critical and strategic ores, minerals, and metals.

I feel it would do the job that must be done for lead and zinc, and do it for much less cost than would have the sliding-scale bill. In addition, it would put the help in the hands of those who need it most—the marginal mines producing 20 percent of the Nation's lead and zinc.

The proposed average payments would be approximately $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound for lead and 4 cents per pound for zinc. At present market prices, the estimated cost of stabilizing lead and zinc under the bill during the 12 months' period July 1953 through July 1954 would be a little over \$15 million, or about one-fourth of the estimated cost of the sliding-scale import tax on these metals.

The plan would set up a Mine Incentive Payments Division in the Defense Materials Procurement Agency and stabilize the system for 5 years. Participation would be entirely voluntary, and payments would be based on costs of production plus adequate allowances for depreciation, amortization, depletion, and a reasonable profit. No engineering examination of the mine would be required, but necessary variations in payment would be determined from the actual reports of the mine operator.

Should production costs increase, payment limits would rise in accordance with Bureau of Labor statistics.

This is not a price-support bill in any sense of the word. It is designed merely to provide operators with enough income to keep them in business and keep strategic metals in production so they will be available for national defense. The minerals produced will be transferred to national stockpiles at current market prices and thus be kept from depressing the market.

In my estimation, it is foolhardy in the extreme not to have machinery in operation that will keep our domestic mining industry healthy and sound, ready for any national or international emergency in which we may find ourselves.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EMERGENCY FAMINE RELIEF AUTHORITY

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine, or other urgent relief requirements, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman's request?

The SPEAKER. To agree to a conference on a bill.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HOPE, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, HILL, COOLEY, and POAGE.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations may have until midnight tonight to file its fifth intermediate report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OMNIBUS JUDGESHIP BILL

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill S. 15, with Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS] is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] for 30 minutes.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can add anything to enlighten the Members of the House as to the nature and character of this bill. The report is available and sets out fully what this bill attempts to achieve; namely, that of creating a number of circuit and district judgeships and in making a number of temporary judgeships permanent.

I might point out at the outset that there is a distinction between the bill which originated in the other body and the bill we are presenting to you here in the nature of amendments to the Senate bill, which amendments we hope will prevail. There is a difference in the number of judges and positions that are created. They are as follows:

The bill which originated in the other body provided for 39 appointments. The bill now before the House for consideration provides for 26. These appointments I speak of have to do with district judges and circuit judges, as well as a number of temporary appointments.

The difference between the two bills is this: We have eliminated, so far as we could differentiate from the bill that originated in the other body, the following judges: The one the Senate provided for in Arizona is eliminated, 1 in Michigan, 1 in Nevada. In northern Ohio where there was a request for 2, 1 was eliminated. In Pennsylvania where there was a request for 2 in eastern Pennsylvania, 1 was eliminated. In western Pennsylvania 1 was eliminated where the request was for 2. A request for a judge for the State of Utah was eliminated, 1 in Washington, 1 in Alaska, Puerto Rico, and in Florida where there was a request made for 2 this bill confines the appointment to 1. The language of this bill spells all this out specifically.

There is also a difference in the nature of their terms. The bill, S. 15, provides that there shall be 3 temporary judgeships created in the State of New York. The bill before the House at the present time does away with the 3 temporary judgeships and provides for 2 permanents.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the gentleman explain why a judgeship in the State of Washington was eliminated? I understood it was in the Senate bill and was taken out on the House side.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I can only say to the gentleman from Washington,

that the committee endeavored to arrive at a solution as to whether all these judges were necessary in the first place; and following that we had to eliminate some of the judges that the Senate bill provided for, according to population and according to the number of judgeships that exists in a particular area. There was also the caseload and other factors that enter into a determination of a question of this kind. We may not have been entirely accurate, but it was the feeling of the committee that a curtailment of the number of judges that the other body had provided had to be made.

We did not single out the gentleman's State at all. In a balancing of all the factors, and in making the necessary deductions therefrom, we arrived at an equitable, sound solution which we thought would meet with the approval of the House. It so happens that Washington did not get an additional judge under those considerations.

Mr. HOLMES. There has been a tremendous increase in population in the State of Washington and up and down the Pacific Coast. It seems to me we presented a very valid case for an additional judge in that State.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. May I say that there is merit to what the gentleman says, but let me give him one instance. The State of Washington already has three Federal judges. I realize there is a gradual increase in population in your State, there is no question about that, but the State of Indiana, which has over 4 million people, nearly 5 million people, as a matter of fact, and as long as we have had a record of judgeships in the last 3 or 4 decades, has had but 2 judges. In order to give that State recognition on the basis of its population, and other States that are in the same situation, and I will be glad to give the gentleman the facts to support the contention that we had to make this distinction. That is one reason that was done.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. We have just listened to a discussion here that was not perhaps apropos of the present legislation about the conservation of funds. What is it contemplated, if this bill is enacted, it will cost the Federal Treasury?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I will answer the gentleman's question as accurately as I can. Part of it is based on conjecture and part on fact. It has been repeatedly argued that a judgeship entails a cost of \$50,000. Of course, \$50,000 multiplied by the number of judges answers itself mathematically. But, may I say to the gentleman that is not the whole story. We continually omit to inform the House or the public that when a judge takes office he also has instrumentalities at his disposal that create additional funds. Every litigant is penalized for going into court and litigating his dispute. We do not have any complete record of the amount of money that is collected in the Clerk's office for

court costs and all matters incidental thereto, but it runs into the millions. So, it is not a complete loss from a dollar and cent standpoint when we appoint a Federal judge.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How many judges are being created? I notice there are 19 permanent judges. What else?

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. There are 19 permanent judges to be created, 3 United States Circuit Court judges, and 4 temporary judges under this bill which makes a total of 26. The number of judges created under the Senate bill was 39. Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. I would also like to point out that there are various provisions in this bill which have to do with making temporary judgeships permanent and, as has already been stated here in the discussion by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, there are some provisions with reference to establishing the abode or the place where the judge who is appointed shall reside.

Now, just one other comment about the overall picture that we have before us. I am not going to try to enter into a detailed or dramatic discussion dealing with the necessity of creating additional judicial positions. There are in this House probably by a great preponderance, as compared to all occupations, a great many lawyers, and they know and ought to know and I am sure do know the necessity for creating judgeships whenever there is a backlog of cases, and that justice is denied to the people in any given community when the courts cannot function efficiently. I cannot tell you all that the investigations have disclosed; I cannot detail specifically all of the conditions existing in some of the areas in the various States. I think the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, will point out more ably than I can point out the difficulty they have in the State of Pennsylvania. We had this information before our committee. In one district they had to cease trying civil cases entirely. They were compelled to give attention to criminal cases of record only because of the crowded calendar. The civil calendar is completely abandoned for the time being.

I hope this bill will not meet with any objection and I hope the House will accept the bill in the spirit in which it has been presented. We have endeavored to try to fulfill the needs of the various areas that we believe were justly and rightfully entitled to an additional judge. We are not in accord in some respects, as to the number of circuit judges. We eliminated 1 in the State of California and added 1 in the State of Texas. That is the only difference so far as circuit judges are concerned.

Mr. Chairman, I hope in the final analysis this bill may meet with the approval of the Members of the House, and that it will pass.

(Mr. JONAS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I may first state to the House here that I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JONAS], and also the members that served on this subcommittee, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], for the time that they have spent in listening to the testimony on this particular bill now before the committee for consideration. This matter came over to the House following exhaustive hearings held in the other body, and this subcommittee not only had the benefit of those hearings but also a number of bills, amounting to about 18, along this particular line. Considerable written material was also offered the committee. The committee listened to witnesses for a number of days, and I dare say, Mr. Chairman, that more time was given to this particular bill than any other bill that came before the subcommittee in this session.

This matter is nothing new to the Members of the House. Last year and the year before this committee came before the House and at that time we explained to you the necessity for these additional judges. Your Committee on the Judiciary at the last session reported out a bill of like nature, but unfortunately it was not passed in this body because of the fact that some Members of the House were fearful that a certain gentleman would make those appointments. For that reason and none other that I know of they were in opposition to this bill. If the need was there last year it certainly is here at this time. We of the minority side, being for the bill last session, of course must support this bill and of course are quite willing to support it because of the fact that we have had these case loads before us and we know of the need for these judges.

As the chairman of the subcommittee has well stated, Mr. Chairman, this committee has reduced the number of judges from the number carried in the Senate bill. We have stricken out all after the enacting clause and put in our own bill, and have reduced the number of judges to 26 from 39. The Senate bill carried provision for 39 judges. We have tried to prune down as much as we possibly could, knowing that perhaps the greater number of those 39 are needed, but at this time your committee felt that if we recommended 26 we were doing exceptionally well.

One of the chief criticisms leveled at the American judicial system is that it is cluttered by a backlog of cases.

We do not have the personnel to handle the workload that keeps step with an expanding population and the increasing complexity of life in the 1950's.

with the funds, and after the program of the preceding year was completed they have always submitted to Congress a complete and full statement of what was done with the money. So I certainly believe that in the administration of this particular program involving foreign currencies there has been no abuse and certainly no expenditures made as to which Congress was not fully informed. In accepting the agreement I by no means accept the possible implication, which I know is not even intended—

Mr. FERGUSON. It was not intended.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not want any implication raised that there has been any abuse of the use of foreign currency.

The limitations in the basic law authorizing the program are very clear, and they have been followed. It is distinct from programs involving counterpart funds under MSA and other programs. I do not think that at any time has this particular program been subjected to any criticism. Unfortunately all of them fall within the classification covered by the language of the so-called Rabaut amendment and section 1313 of this bill. I am relying upon the committee to defend the provision in conference. We have given up any effort to seek an outright exemption which was requested by the President and proposed in the revised budget which was intended by the amendment just withdrawn. Recognizing the point of wanting control in the other programs, we believe we have made a satisfactory compromise which I think will work satisfactorily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, which I send to the desk. It involves a transfer of funds under salaries and expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 12, it is proposed to add the following:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses: In addition to amounts appropriated under this head, the Administrator may transfer to this appropriation from any other funds available for administrative expenses not to exceed the sum of \$50,000 for studies and surveys which the President may request of the housing policies and programs of the Government and of organization for the administration of such programs, and for expenses of advisers and consultants in connection therewith.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are anxious to have a study made, as is the President, so that Congress may be advised on the important question of housing and public housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, has the Senator from Michigan

given any thought to providing in the pending bill that any cargo shipped under the \$200 million advanced to Korea be carried in American flag vessels, rather than in MST vessels? I do not want to suggest to the Senator anything that would interfere seriously with the program.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe it should go into the pending bill with regard to the \$200 million provision. Much of the food and clothing is already over there. I believe it is a matter which should come up later. I appreciate the Senator's interest in shipping goods in American bottoms, but we could not accept such a provision in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6200) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks at the desk be authorized to change chapter and section numbers in order to correspond with the amendments adopted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. McCARRAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

EMERGENCY RELIEF FOR FRIENDLY COUNTRIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President, out of stocks of agricultural commodities acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations, such agricultural commodities as may be requested by the President for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations. Not more than \$100 million (including the Corporation's investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all transfers and deliveries under this act, of which not more than \$20 million shall go to any single country.

The President may make such transfers through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate. At least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of agricultural commodities made available under this act and transported from the United States on ocean vessels shall be so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent practicable and to the extent such vessels are available at market rates for United States flag vessels.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the costs incurred in making deliveries hereunder.

SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this act after March 15, 1954.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to make agricultural commodities owned by it available to the President for the purpose of enabling the President to assist in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements of peoples friendly to the United States."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. HOEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMPACT BETWEEN KENTUCKY AND VIRGINIA RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A BI-STATE PARK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I shall move that Calendar No. 696, Senate Joint Resolution 81, be made the unfinished business. Then I shall call up a conference report.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 696, Senate Joint Resolution No. 81.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 81) granting the consent of Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the establishment of a bi-State park by the States of Kentucky and Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

JURISDICTION OVER SUBMERGED LANDS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the

terested in this problem over the years, that with this colloquy and the report of the committee, it will be made clear that Congress would like to see private agencies used to as great an extent as possible. I believe they are efficient. As the Senator from Iowa has said, the people have more confidence in a privately operated station than in one operated by a Government agency. I am very glad that the Senator from Iowa brought the proposal forward.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator from Iowa will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. Did the Committee on Appropriations generally agree that the use of private agencies in the past, where indicated, has been successful? Have they been efficient in getting information to foreign countries?

Mr. FERGUSON. The evidence has so indicated. So far as I am aware, there is no evidence to the contrary. However, there has been a feeling of apathy on the part of previous administrators. They wanted a monopoly. The committee does not agree with that attitude.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is the whole trouble.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There are several private broadcasters, most of whose business is commercial, but they can accept and use some of the Information program very successfully in what otherwise would be a strictly commercial operation. I know that such operations have been successful. We have found evidences of it in various parts of the world.

I think perhaps it is better not to use words of limitation, so that if the Administrator feels that he could spend \$400,000 or \$500,000 properly, he should be encouraged to do so if it is for the best interests of the program. He should not be limited to \$70,000 or \$150,000.

With that understanding, and with the statement that I earnestly hope that the Administrator will take it as the sense of this body that these facilities are to be used to a greater extent than they have been used in the past, I am happy to accommodate the Senator from Michigan and withdraw my amendment, which is one of limitation. I think the bill will be better off without it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, line 21, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,700,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This involves the reconsideration of a committee amendment which has heretofore been amended. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 26, line 21, as amended

by the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], was agreed to, is reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have discussed this question with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the acting majority leader. This item was recommended in the Senate Appropriations Committee report on the civil functions bill. The amount there recommended was \$615,000. It is felt that \$400,000 will give us a start, and will be adequate. It is very important for the security of the harbor, in the movement of iron ore to and from Duluth and Superior.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think there is a technical change needed, because there had been prior additions to the bill. So I think the mathematics will be corrected at the desk. As I understand, the additional amount which the Senator is asking is \$400,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. \$400,000 additional.

Mr. KNOWLAND. This is in connection with a project which had gone into the civil functions bill after hearing. I will say, as chairman of the civil functions subcommittee, that the subcommittee placed it in the regular bill because it thought the project was meritorious. Speaking personally, I have no objection to having the additional \$400,000 taken to conference, to develop such additional information as is possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the majority leader. Let me say that this request is supported by the business community, and I believe by the Army Engineers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, under the circumstances, and with the explanation offered, realizing that this is an important matter and should have the attention of the conference, I shall be glad to take the amendment to conference. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Michigan, and the acting majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the committee amendment on page 26, line 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment which I called up a moment ago, the one designated "7-28-53-A," on page 46 of the bill, referring to the question of freeing the foreign currencies which we own from the operation of the appropriations provision, the language to which I referred as being in the course of development at that time is now ready. I think the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has language which I understand is satisfactory to all concerned, and which we believe will at least meet the immediate problems in connection with the exchange-of-persons program. I therefore should like to yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for the presentation of the language which I mentioned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall have to read it, because it is written in longhand and I am sure the clerk would not be able to read my writing. I will read it slowly, and I hope accurately. It is the language which has been worked out after consultation with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and the Comptroller General and the committee. I offer the following amendment: On page 46, line 12, strike out the period and insert a colon in lieu thereof, followed by:

Provided further, That nothing in section 1415 of the act of July 15, 1952, or in this section shall be construed to prevent the making of contracts, agreements, or executive agreements for periods in excess of 1 year, or the carrying out of any contracts, agreements, or executive agreements heretofore made for periods in excess of 1 years in any case where such contracts, agreements, or executive agreements, for periods in excess of 1 year were permitted prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This amendment is intended to insure that the terms of existing agreements under the International Information and Educational activities, authorized by law and provided for in this appropriation, shall not be vitiated in the process of bringing the foreign currencies involved under the appropriation procedure, and that such agreements may continue to be made and carried out as heretofore for necessary periods in excess of 1 year. It requires no additional cash, and it does not disturb the proposed appropriation.

It is understood that the amount of \$8,859,791, requested for the program, and included in the \$60 million amount appropriated by the House and in the \$80 million amount recommended by the Senate committee, is retained for the program authorized by Public Law 584.

That represents the agreement of the various agencies involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee was trying to keep the foreign currencies and counterpart funds under the control of Congress. It was not endeavoring to destroy the program, as the Senator from Arkansas well knows. However, we did run into the snag of how to do it in this particular case. I believe it is all important to have control over it. Therefore, with the Senator from Virginia and other Senators who are interested we have been endeavoring on all bills to keep control of the currencies through appropriations and felt that this was the right way to do it. I am glad that we have been able to work out an agreement. I recommend the adoption of the amendment, and we shall be glad to take it to conference, in the hope that the conferees will accept it as the solution of the problem. I know they are as anxious as we are to keep control of the currencies and funds involved.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan. I want to say that those administering this program never thought they were not under control. They have in this program always submitted to the Bureau of the Budget and to the committees of both Houses of Congress a precise estimate of what they were doing

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued August 3, 1953

For actions of July 31 & Aug. 1, 1953

83rd-1st, Nos. 145 and 146

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	Foreign trade.....	84	Reorganization..	4, 18, 20, 82
.....12, 14, 37, 38, 49, 58	Forestry..	17, 34, 42, 64, 69, 83	Research.....	51
Commodity exchanges...9, 48	Fruit.....	89	Safety.....	8, 22
Corn quotas.....	Immigration.....	3, 23	Social security.....	36
11, 14, 52	Labor, farm.....	7, 28, 55	Soil cons. .	13, 65, 70, 74, 80
Cotton allotments.....	Loans, farm.....	4, 20, 29, 34, 54, 61, 67	Storage facilities.....	40
5	Meat packing.....	71	Surpluses.....	63, 66, 86
Crop insurance.....	Nomination.....	30	Taxation.....	50
24	Payrolling.....	50	Tobacco.....	93
Debt limit..	Penalty mail.....	33	Trade agreements.....	53
1, 19, 31, 68, 79, 92	Personnel.....	6, 14, 31	Training, farm.....	88
Economic Advisers.....	Potato supports.....	10, 47	Treaty powers.....	43, 85
73	Price supports....	10, 47, 67	Water.....	60, 62, 80, 90
Education.....	Property, surplus.....	32	Weather control.....	15, 26
35, 57	Reclamation....	16, 17, 25, 27	Wheat agreement.....	91
Electricity...45, 60, 77, 90				
Expenditures.....				
75				
Farm machinery.....				
76				
Farm program.....				
39, 45				
Foundations study.....				
56				
Foreign aid.....				
.....2, 12, 18, 21, 30, 78				

HIGHLIGHTS: Congressional action was completed on bills to reorganize FCA, provide famine relief, permit refugee immigration, expand crop insurance, study weather control, modify reclamation units, require penalty-mail payments, authorize forest loans, transfer cotton field station, extend fur-farmer loans, extend Mexican farm-labor program. House adopted conference reports on supplemental appropriations, foreign-aid appropriations, trade agreements. House passed bills to increase debt limit and modify corn and cotton quotas. Senate passed farm-tenant interest bill. Congress received President's messages on conservation and social security. Senate received Benson letter asking farm-program recommendations. House committee reported onion-marketing and potato-support bills. Bills were introduced on grazing procedures, soil-water conservation, and surplus disposal.

HOUSE - July 31

- 1. DEBT LIMIT.** Passed, 239-158, without amendment H. R. 6672, increasing the U. S. statutory debt limit from \$275 billion to \$290 billion (pp. 10964-87, 11009).
- 2. FAMINE RELIEF.** Agreed, 143-15, to the conference report on S. 2249, to enable the President, during the period ending Mar. 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the U. S. emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements. The overall limitation of \$100,000,000 remains, but the limit of \$20,000,000 for any one country was eliminated. Language was inserted to make it clear that the authority of CCC to deliver commodities under the bill is limited to the delivery of such commodities aboard vessels in U. S. ports. Therefore, all costs incurred in making delivery of the commodities after they have been placed on board will have to be paid either by the recipient countries or from NSA or other funds, and the \$100,000,000 limit will apply only to CCC investment and costs. Because of this action the conferees eliminated the provision that at least half of the shipments be made on U. S.-flag ships, since NSA already follows this policy. (pp. 10992-3).

3. IMMIGRATION. Agreed, 190-44, to the conference report on H. R. 6481, to admit into the U. S. for permanent residence up to 214,000 refugees, orphans, and certain close relatives of U. S. citizens and aliens admitted for permanent residence (pp. 10988-991).
4. FCA REORGANIZATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4353, to reorganize the Farm Credit Administration, etc. (pp. 10991-2). For provisions of report, see Digest 144.
5. COTTON ALLOTMENTS. Passed without amendment H. R. 6665, which provides that the national cotton acreage allotment for 1954 will be 22,500,000 acres (basic), that no State will receive an acreage cut of more than 29.5% below its 1952 acreage. (the acreage for this is to be in addition to the national allotment), that State acreage reserves shall be used in addition to other purposes for correcting inequities in farm allotments, that with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture county committees may apportion farm acreage allotments on the basis of previous farm history, and that for 1954 and 1955 any part of the acreage allotted to any farm which is voluntarily surrendered by the operator of that farm may be reallocated to other farms in the county (pp. 10932-40). The bill had been reported without amendment by the Agriculture Committee earlier in the day (H. Rept. 1058)(p. 11009).
6. PERSONNEL. Agreed to a Senate amendment to H. R. 6185, to require that veterans attain a passing grade before becoming eligible for civil-service appointments (pp. 10963-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.
7. FARM LABOR. Received the conference report on H. R. 3480, to extend the Mexican farm-labor program. The conferees agreed on an extension for 2 years instead of the House period of 3 years and the Senate period of 1 year. (p. 10993.)
8. SAFETY. Received the conference report on S. 1105, to incorporate the National Safety Council (pp. 10993-5).
9. COMMODITY EXCHANGES. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6435, to extend the Commodity Exchange Act to onions (p. D823).
10. POTATO SUPPORTS. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 3895, to remove the prohibition against price supports on Irish potatoes (p. D823).
11. CORN QUOTAS. The Agriculture Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. J. Res. 321, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act with respect to the date of the proclamation of corn marketing quotas. The "Daily Digest" states: "Under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture must determine whether or not such quotas are necessary and make his proclamation not later than November 15 of the year prior to that in which quotas are to be invoked. This measure will postpone the 1954 proclamation until February 1, 1954, and is designed to give Congress an opportunity to reexamine the quota law before the Secretary is required to make his determination." (p. D823.)
12. FOREIGN-AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Agreed, 237-156, to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6391, and acted on amendments in disagreement (pp. 10920-8). For provisions of the report see Digest 144.
13. CONSERVATION. Received from the President a message favoring additional conservation and development of land and water resources, etc. (H. Doc. 221)(pp. 90923-9).

EMERGENCY FAMINE RELIEF AUTHORITY

JULY 31, 1953.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HOPE, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany S. 2249]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: *That, in order to enable the President to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President out of its stocks such agricultural commodities f. o. b. vessels in United States ports as he may request for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations. Not more than \$100,000,000 (including the Corporation's investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all transfers, including delivery on board vessels, under this section. The President may make such transfer through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate.*

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums

as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the cost incurred in making deliveries hereunder.

SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this Act after March 15, 1954.

And the House agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the House struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted the provisions of the House bill. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

Except for minor and clarifying changes, the difference between the conference substitute and the bill as passed by the House are explained below.

The language in section 1 follows in general the wording of the Senate bill. Clarifying language has been added at two places to carry out the intent of the House bill and to make it clear that the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to deliver commodities under the authority of this act is limited to the delivery of such commodities aboard vessels in United States ports.

The language in section 2 of the substitute agreed on by the conferees follows precisely the language of the House amendment. There is also no change in section 3.

The conference, by accepting the language of section 2 of the House amendment, eliminates from the conference substitute the provision in section 2 of the Senate bill similar to the provision of the House bill as reported which was stricken from the bill by a point of order in the House. As a consequence of this action, all costs incurred in making delivery of the commodities after they have been placed on board vessels in United States ports will have to be paid either by the recipient countries or some other agency, or by the President from funds of the Mutual Security Agency or other funds available to him, and the \$100,000,000 limitation will apply only to the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the commodities including costs incurred by it in making delivery on board vessels in United States ports. This procedure is in keeping with the normal operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation and permits the use of transit rates which are in effect on large volumes of commodities.

This action also made it unnecessary to retain in the conference substitute the provision of the House amendment requiring that at least 50 percent of the commodities shipped overseas pursuant to this legislation should be shipped in United States flag vessels. It is the established policy of the Mutual Security Agency to follow this principle in shipment of United States commodities abroad and it is

assumed that that policy will continue to be followed in this instance.

The overall limitation of \$100,000,000 on expenditure for commodities transferred under this act remains in the conference substitute, but the limitation in the House amendment that not more than \$20,000,000 could be expended for any one country was eliminated.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

()

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS"

"SEC. 18. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

"REPORTS"

"SEC. 19. The Administrator shall report to the President and the Congress on the operation of the program established under this act on or about January 15 and June 15 of each year and shall submit a final report not later than June 15, 1957. Such reports shall include full and complete details regarding the administration of the act and the administration of the funds provided for in section 16 of this Act.

"TERMINATION"

"SEC. 20. No immigrant visa shall be issued under this Act after December 31, 1956."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of certain refugees, and orphans, and for other purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
RUTH THOMPSON,
EMANUEL CELLER,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
PAT McCARRAN,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6481) to authorize the issuance of 217,000 special quota immigrant visas, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The compromise bill would admit into the United States for permanent residence up to a maximum of 214,000 refugees, orphans and certain close relatives of United States citizens and aliens admitted for permanent residence. The program authorized under this legislation is to be administered by existing agencies, to wit: the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice.

Except as otherwise expressly provided in this measure, all of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act shall be applicable in the administration of the new law. The conferees wish to state at this point that the new law does not constitute an amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is considered to be an emergency relief measure designed to implement certain phases of American foreign policy. It is not intended to represent any precedent or commitment on the part of the Congress or the Government of the United States to participate as an immigrant receiving country in any international endeavors aimed at a permanent solution of the problem of surplus populations as it now apparently exists in certain parts of Europe and Asia.

In the opinion of the conferees, the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy established pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act, shall exercise continuous and diligent watchfulness over the operations undertaken under the new law, and the Congress should be at all times aware of such operations.

While no definition is contained in the act, the conferees wish to state that the term "firm resettlement" as applied to pro-

spective beneficiaries of this legislation is not designed automatically to exclude aliens from the refugee category solely on the ground that they have been collectively, by law or edict, granted full or limited citizenship rights and privileges in any area of their present residence.

The conferees desire further to stress that this legislation constitutes in no way a mandate to issue, within the prescribed period of time, the full number of visas allocated under this legislation. These are, in each case, maximum limitations, not quotas to be filled. It is to be clearly understood that this bill offers opportunities to enter the United States to a certain number of eligible aliens but that no special effort should be made to evade any of the provisions of this act or of the Immigration and Nationality Act in order to bring in such number or any number. Similarly, it is the unanimous consensus of the conferees that no efforts should be made to induce aliens to seek entry to the United States under this bill.

The bill as passed the House provided for the following classes of aliens to be admitted into the United States (definitions have been abbreviated here):

German expellees.....	60,000
Nationals of Italy.....	60,000
Nationals of Greece.....	20,000
Nationals of the Netherlands.....	20,000
Nationals of Japan.....	2,000
Arab refugees.....	2,000
Chinese refugees.....	2,000
Refugees in Germany and Austria.....	25,000
Refugees in NATO countries.....	15,000
Polish ex-soldiers.....	3,000
European refugees in Hong Kong.....	2,000
Nationals of Portugal.....	2,000
Orphans.....	4,000

Total..... 217,000

Adjustments of refugee status: No number specified but within 217,000 limit.

The bill as passed by the Senate contained the following categories (abbreviated definitions):

Escapees and German expellees.....	92,000
Escapees in NATO countries.....	10,000
Chinese refugees.....	2,000
Italian refugees.....	62,000
Greek refugees.....	17,000
Dutch refugees.....	17,000
Adjustment cases in the United States.....	5,000
Orphans.....	4,000

Total..... 209,000

The bill as recommended by the conferees provides for the following groups and allocations:

German expellees.....	55,000
Escapees in Western Germany, Berlin, and Austria.....	35,000
Escapees in NATO countries.....	10,000
Polish ex-soldiers.....	2,000
Italian refugees.....	45,000
Italian relatives.....	15,000
Greek refugees.....	15,000
Greek relatives.....	2,000
Netherlands refugees.....	15,000
Netherlands relatives.....	2,000
Far East refugees (Non-Asian).....	2,000
Far East refugees (Asian).....	3,000
Chinese (passports endorsed by National Government).....	2,000
Arab refugees.....	2,000
Orphans.....	4,000
Adjustments of refugee status.....	5,000

Total..... 214,000

LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
RUTH THOMPSON,
EMANUEL CELLER,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6481) to authorize the issuance of 217,000 special quota visas, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, in general I think this conference report is worthy of support. I have, however, some hesitancy about changes made in my amendments for refugees from Asia. I refer particularly to the restriction placed on the 2000 Chinese refugees, that they must have passports of the Government of the Republic of China, temporarily on Formosa. I appreciate the objective of giving support and authority to that government. I think I can claim to have demonstrated as much concern for its being strengthened as anyone in our country. And I applaud the desire to make sure that no Chinese Reds or other enemies of our Chinese friends and allies should be among those privileged to be admitted to our country.

But I do not believe it is ever wise to give any foreign government anywhere any control or veto over those whom we choose to admit as immigrants. Furthermore, the desire to get one of those passports will be of life and death importance to many desperate people. Vigilance will be needed by those who will be administering the program.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the report is unanimous. I have no requests for time. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SUTTON) there were—ayes 190, noes 44.

So the conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARM CREDIT ACT OF 1953

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4353) to increase farmer participation in ownership and control of the Federal Farm Credit System; to create a Federal Farm Credit Board; to abolish certain offices; to impose a franchise tax upon certain farm credit institutions; and for other purposes; and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 30, 1953.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I think the differences between the two bills and the final form of the bill are very well described in the conference report. Unless there are questions concerning the matter, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAMINE RELIEF BILL

Mr. HOPE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1070)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That, in order to enable the President to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President out of its stocks such agricultural commodities f. o. b. vessels in United States ports as he may request for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations. Not more than \$100,000,000 (including the Corporation's investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all transfers, including delivery on board vessels, under this section. The President may make such transfer through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate.

"Sec. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the cost incurred in making deliveries hereunder.

"Sec. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this Act after March 15, 1954."

And the House agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendment of the House struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substituted the provisions of the House bill. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

Except for minor and clarifying changes, the difference between the conference substitute and the bill as passed by the House are explained below.

The language in section 1 follows in general the wording of the Senate bill. Clarifying language has been added at two places to carry out the intent of the House bill and to make it clear that the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to deliver commodities under the authority of this act is limited to the delivery of such commodities aboard vessels in United States ports.

The language in section 2 of the substitute agreed on by the conferees follows precisely the language of the House amendment. There is also no change in section 3.

The conference, by accepting the language of section 2 of the House amendment, eliminates from the conference substitute the provision in section 2 of the Senate bill similar to the provision of the House bill as reported which was stricken from the bill by a point of order in the House. As a consequence of this action, all costs incurred in making delivery of the commodities after they have been placed on board vessels in United States ports will have to be paid either by the recipient countries or some other agency, or by the President from funds of the Mutual Security Agency or other funds available to him, and the \$100,000,000 limitation will apply only to the investment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the commodities including costs incurred by it in making delivery on board vessels in United States ports. This procedure is in keeping with the normal operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation and permits the use of transit rates which are in effect on large volumes of commodities.

This action also made it unnecessary to retain in the conference substitute the provision of the House amendment requiring that at least 50 percent of the commodities shipped overseas pursuant to this legislation should be shipped in United States flag vessels. It is the established policy of the Mutual Security Agency to follow this principle in shipment of United States commodities abroad and it is assumed that that policy will continue to be followed in this instance.

The overall limitation of \$100,000,000 on expenditure for commodities transferred under this act remains in the conference substitute, but the limitation in the House amendment that not more than \$20,000,000 could be expended for any one country was eliminated.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2249, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

[Mr. TOLLEFSON's remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I think the statement of the managers tells very fully and completely the changes which were worked out between the conferees. There were some differences between the two bills, but the statement of the managers, I think, points out the final form of the bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. What did the conferees do with respect to the provision which was contained in the House version of the bill concerning the so-called 50-50 provision, which provided that 50 percent of any cargoes carried on ocean vessels should be carried in American flag vessels?

Mr. HOPE. That provision was in the House bill, but was not in the Senate bill. With respect to that provision, the House receded and, therefore, it is not to be found in the bill in its final form. Under the provisions of the bill, as described in the conference report and by reason of the striking out of certain language in the House bill on a point of order, it is not possible for the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay ocean freight charges. It will be necessary for the Mutual Security Agency or some other Government agency to pay those charges. We state in the report that in view of the fact that the Mutual Security Agency has been following a policy of using at least 50 percent of American

lines for the shipment of its commodities, it is assumed that they will continue to use that policy and, therefore, it is not necessary that that provision remain in the bill.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Do I understand then from the gentleman from Kansas that the report calls attention to the fact that it has heretofore been the policy that 50 percent of cargoes be carried in American flag vessels?

Mr. HOPE. Yes, I will be glad to read that provision in the report.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. That is not necessary as long as I have the gentleman's assurance to that effect.

Mr. HOPE. It is the next to the last paragraph of the report. I think it states the matter clearly enough, and there is no reason to believe that the usual practice in that regard will not be followed.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. What provision, if any, was made for the payment of transportation or transfer of the Commodity Credit Corporation stock?

Mr. HOPE. Under the provisions of the House bill, which language was stricken out on a point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri, there was no provision by which the Commodity Credit Corporation could use its funds for the purpose of paying transportation charges. Of course, that language could not be reinserted in the conference because it would again be subject to a point of order when the conference report was submitted to the House. However, the conferees did adopt a provision in the first section of the bill which provides that the commodities shall be made available to the President f. o. b. vessels in United States ports. This means that the Commodity Credit Corporation would pay the transportation charges to shipboard and the unloading charges, which they can do without any additional appropriation, because they have the funds already which can be used for that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Will the gentleman answer another question? Would that not be using funds for a purpose for which they were not appropriated?

Mr. HOPE. No.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It would be a circumvention of the language which was struck out in the bill?

Mr. HOPE. No. Under other provisions of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation has authority to pay charges on shipments going out of this country to shipboard.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to suggest that the reason for the action taken by the conferees is the fact that the bill itself authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to make deliveries, but it did not fix the place of delivery. So in changing the language in the bill, we

only fixed the place of delivery and fixed that as f. o. b. vessels in American ports.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me half a minute to make a statement?

Mr. HOPE. I yield the gentleman half a minute.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. There was a misunderstanding at the time the gentleman from Missouri made his point of order to the language in the bill. My purpose there was not to try to cut down the stocks that would be available, but rather to increase them. And that would have been done had this language been carried in the bill, and if funds for the transfer and transportation had been made available by the Mutual Security Administration which does have funds that they could have made available, more food would have been available than they have under the language that the conferees have brought back in this bill.

I am not going to try to delay the passage of the bill, but I still maintain that my position at that time was sound and it would have been sound if that language had been maintained in this bill.

Mr. HOPE. That is still the effect of the gentleman's amendment. It still prevents the Commodity Credit Corporation from paying all of the ocean freight and other transportation charges except to shipboard.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The MSA, or the recipient country, or the President from some other fund which is now available to him, would have to pay the freight on all the shipments that are to be made beyond the point of American ports.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Briefly, I yield.

Mr. FULTON. As the gentleman will recall, I had an amendment to strike out the \$20 million limitation per country.

Mr. HOPE. I will say to the gentleman that that is out.

Mr. FULTON. That is out, and there is no limitation on zones or countries?

Mr. HOPE. There is no limitation on countries.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and (on a division demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 143, noes 15.

So the conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 509 OF TITLE V OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

Mr. HOPE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949,

to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1071)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "1955."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended title proposed by the Senate, amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 509 of title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 2 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3480) to amend section 509 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, to extend for 3 years the period during which agricultural workers may be made available for employment under such title, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill extended the law for 3 years. The Senate amendment extended the law for only 1 year. The agreement reached by the committee of conference will extend the law for 2 years.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1105) to incorporate the National Safety Council:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1072)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1105) to incorporate the National Safety Council, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do

recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That Melvin H. Baker, Lawrence D. Bell, James B. Black, S. Bruce Black, Morgan B. Brainard, John W. Carpenter, Ray Carr, William G. Chandler, Kenneth B. Colman, Frederick C. Crawford, Walter J. Cummings, Richard R. Deupree, Benjamin F. Fairless, Wallace Falvey, Francis J. Gavin, George A. Jacoby, George E. Leighty, Horace P. Liveridge, Henry E. North, Thomas I. Parkinson, A. V. Rohweder, William A. Simpson, Lee E. Skeel, W. A. Stewart, John Stilwell, J. E. Trainer, and Juan T. Trippe are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of National Safety Council (hereinafter called the corporation) and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers and limitations contained in this Act.

"COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

"SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

"OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

"SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

"(1) to further, encourage, and promote methods and procedures leading to increased safety, protection, and health among employees and employers and among children, in industries, on farms, in schools and colleges, in homes, on streets and highways, in recreation, and in other public and private places;

"(2) to collect, correlate, publish, distribute, and disseminate educational and informative data, reports, and all other data relative to safety methods and procedures;

"(3) to arouse and maintain the interest of the people of the United States, its Territories and possessions in safety and in accident prevention, and to encourage the adoption and institution of safety methods by all persons, corporations, and other organizations;

"(4) to organize, establish, and conduct programs, lectures, conferences, and other activities for the education of all persons, corporations, and other organizations in safety methods and procedures;

"(5) to organize, and to aid in the organization of, local safety chapters throughout the United States, its Territories and possessions, and to provide organizational guidance and materials to promote the national safety;

"(6) to cooperate with, enlist, and develop the cooperation of and between all persons, corporations, and other organizations and agencies, both public and private, engaged or interested in, or in any manner connected with, any or all of the foregoing purposes; and

"(7) to do any and all lawful acts which may be necessary, useful, suitable, desirable, and proper for the furtherance, accomplishment, and attainment of any or all of the foregoing purposes.

"CORPORATE POWERS

"SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

"(1) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

"(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

"(3) to choose such officers, directors, trustees, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

"(4) to adopt, amend, and alter a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which the corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

"(5) to contract and be contracted with;

"(6) to charge and collect membership dues, subscription fees, and receive contributions or grants of money or property to be devoted to the carrying out of its purposes;

"(7) to take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject to applicable provisions of law in any State (a) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (b) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real or personal property by a corporation operating in such State;

"(8) to transfer, encumber, and convey real or personal property;

"(9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law;

"(10) to use the corporate funds to give prizes, awards, or other evidences of merit or recognition to persons, organizations, associations, or corporations, public or private, for outstanding contributions toward the achievement of the purposes of the corporation;

"(11) to publish magazines and other publications and materials, whether periodic or occasional, consistent with its corporate purposes;

"(12) to organize, establish, and conduct conferences on safety and accident prevention;

"(13) to adopt, alter, use, and display such emblems, seals, and badges as it may adopt;

"(14) to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of its business, and to charter local, State, and regional safety organizations, and to establish, regulate, and discontinue departmental subdivisions and local, State, and regional chapters in appropriate places throughout the United States, its Territories and possessions; and

"(15) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation and, for such purpose, the corporation shall also have, in addition to the foregoing in this section and subsection, the rights, powers, duties, and liabilities of the existing corporation referred to in section 18 as far as they are not modified or superseded by this Act.

"PRINCIPAL OFFICE; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

"SEC. 5. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Chicago, Illinois, or in such other place as may later be determined by the board of directors, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place and may be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

"(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service or process for the corporation, and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

"MEMBERSHIP; VOTING RIGHTS

"SEC. 6. (a) Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide.

"(b) Each member of the corporation, other than honorary and sustaining members, shall have the right to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote at all meetings of the members of the corporation. The corporation may, by its constitution and bylaws, provide for additional voting rights in accordance with dues paid.

"BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; RESPONSIBILITIES

"SEC. 7. Upon enactment of this Act the membership of the initial board of directors of the corporation shall consist of the present members of the board of directors of the National Safety Council, Inc., referred to in section 18 of this Act, or such of them as may then be living and are qualified directors of that corporation, to wit—E. F. du Pont, Wilmington, Delaware; Franklin M. Kreml, Evanston, Illinois; A. F. Allen, Dallas, Texas; J. I. Banash, West Los Angeles, California; William B. Barton, Washington, District of Columbia; C. W. Bergquist, Indianapolis, Indiana; R. A. L. Bogan, Chicago, Illinois; Norman E. Borgerson, Lansing, Michigan; Harry H. Brainerd, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Fred W. Braun, Wausau, Wisconsin; Theo Brown, Moline, Illinois; E. J. Buhner, Louisville, Kentucky; Alfred W. Cantwell, Washington, District of Columbia; Ray Carr, Portland, Oregon; Jesse Clark, Chicago, Illinois; Reginald M. Cleveland, New York, New York; William L. Connolly, Washington, District of Columbia; Doctor B. L. Corbett, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Charles R. Cos, New York, New York; Ernest G. Cox, Washington, District of Columbia; R. S. Damon, Kansas City, Missouri; Ned H. Dearborn, Chicago, Illinois; J. Dewey Dorsett, New York, New York; E. F. du Pont, Wilmington, Delaware; Martin P. Durkin, Washington, District of Columbia; Wallace Falvey, Boston, Massachusetts; Kirk Fox, Des Moines, Iowa; C. H. Gallaway, Southbridge, Massachusetts; George F. Getz, Junior, Chicago, Illinois; Gordon C. Graham, Detroit, Michigan; Howard Gramlich, Chicago, Illinois; W. Earl Hall, Mason City, Iowa; R. A. Harschnek, Chicago, Illinois; O. R. Hartwig, Portland, Oregon; Doctor Herold C. Hunt, Chicago, Illinois; Harold P. Jackson, Newark, New Jersey; George A. Jacoby, Detroit, Michigan; Mrs. George W. Jaqua, Winchester, Indiana; Joseph M. Kaplan, Los Angeles, California; E. W. Kempton, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Mrs. Fred W. Knight, Cartersville, Georgia; Franklin M. Kreml, Evanston, Illinois; Walter G. Legge, New York, New York; Boyd Lewis, New York, New York; Thomas H. MacDonald, College Station, Texas; Miss Marion E. Martin, Augusta, Maine; I. W. Millard, Danville, Illinois; Harry M. Moses, Washington, District of Columbia; D. E. Mumford, New York, New York; Hallie L. Myers, Indianapolis, Indiana; Guy L. Noble, Chicago, Illinois; Henry E. North, San Francisco, California; Clifton W. Phalen, Detroit, Michigan; Harry L. Powell, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Harry Read, Washington, District of Columbia; A. V. Rohweder, Duluth, Minnesota; Robert T. Ross, Dearborn, Michigan; Doctor K. Frances Scott, Northampton, Massachusetts; Honorable Lee E. Skeel, Cleveland, Ohio; Robert R. Snodgrass, Atlanta, Georgia; Leslie J. Sorenson, Chicago, Illinois; Doctor H. J. Stack, New York, New York; J. C. Stennett, Chicago, Illinois; W. A. Stewart, Southbridge, Massachusetts; Miss Judith Waller, Chicago, Illinois; Mrs. George Welles, Junior, Duluth, Minnesota; Doctor George M. Wheatley, New York, New York; E. C. Woodward, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Doctor William P. Yant, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

"(b) Thereafter, the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of such number (not less than fifteen), shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), and shall serve for such term as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

8/1/53

-3-

14. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6200 (pp. 11005-7). The conferees fixed the corn acreage allotment item at \$5,000,000 and reported in disagreement the provision continuing drought-relief funds of Public Law 371, 82nd Cong.
15. WEATHER CONTROL. Passed as reported S. 285, to establish an Advisory Committee on Weather Control to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather control for the purpose of determining the extent to which the U. S. should experiment with, engage in, or regulate weather control (pp. 10930-2).
16. RECLAMATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 5731, to authorize the Santa Margarita River project, Calif. (pp. 10940-1).
17. GRAZING LANDS. Rep. D'Ewart spoke in support of the stockmen's grazing bill and said Rep. Hope was introducing a modified bill on this subject which has the support of various interested parties (p. 10930).
17. RECLAMATION. Rep. D'Ewart recommended the establishment of various additional reclamation projects (p. 10930).

SENATE - July 31

18. FOREIGN AID; REORGANIZATION. Sen. Mansfield criticized the President's reorganization plan establishing a Foreign Operations Administration (pp. 10899-901).
19. DEBT LIMIT. Discussed the President's request for an increase in the debt limit (pp. 10903-8).

SENATE - August 1

20. FCA REORGANIZATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 4353, to reorganize the Farm Credit Administration, etc. (p. 11040). This bill will now be sent to the President.
21. FAMINE RELIEF. Agreed to the conference report on S. 2249, the famine-relief bill (p. 11044). This bill will now be sent to the President.
22. SAFETY. Agreed to the conference report on S. 1105, to incorporate the National Safety Council (p. 11049). This bill will now be sent to the President.
23. IMMIGRATION. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 6481, to authorize immigration of 214,000 refugees, etc. (pp. 11073-7). This bill will now be sent to the President.
24. CROP INSURANCE. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 1367, to continue the authority for expansion of the crop insurance program to additional counties (p. 11044). This bill will now be sent to the President.
25. RECLAMATION. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 2097, to increase the amount authorized for the Eklutna, Alaska, project (pp. 11048-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.
26. WEATHER CONTROL. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 285, to authorize a study of weather-control activities, etc. (p. 11048). This bill will now be sent to the President.
27. RECLAMATION. Concurred in the House amendments to S. 887, to permit the exchange and amendment of farm units on Federal irrigation projects (pp. 11049, 11083-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.

28. FARM LABOR. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 3480, to continue the Mexican farm-labor program for two years (p. 11090).
29. FARM LOANS. Passed as reported S. 1276, to increase the interest rate on farm-tenant loans (pp. 11097, 11104-5).
30. NOMINATION OF Harold E. Stassen, to be Director of Foreign Operations Administration, was confirmed (p. 11136).
31. DEBT LIMIT. The Finance Committee voted to defer further action until the next session of Congress on H. R. 6672, to increase the statutory debt limit (p. 11030).
32. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Passed without amendment H. R. 6382, to extend until June 30, 1954, the period during which GSA may conduct negotiated sales of surplus property (p. 11054). This bill will now be sent to the President.
33. PENALTY MAIL. Passed without amendment H. R. 6281, to require executive departments, etc., to reimburse the Post Office Department for penalty mail (pp. 11078-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.
34. FOREST LOANS. Passed without amendment H. R. 5603, to authorize national banking associations to make loans on forest tracts (pp. 11070-2). This bill will now be sent to the President.
35. EDUCATION. Passed with amendments H. R. 6078 and 6079, to assist school districts in federally affected areas, and Senate conferees were appointed (pp. 11054-66).
36. SOCIAL SECURITY. Both Houses received the President's message recommending inclusion of additional groups, including farmers, in the Social Security Act (H. Doc. 225); to Senate Finance Committee and House Ways and Means Committee (pp. 11213, 11134).
37. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Sen. McCarthy was appointed as an additional conferee on this bill, H. R. 4974 (p. 11035).
38. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954. Rejected the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6200. Senate conferees were appointed for a further conference. (pp. 11097-104)
39. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Aiken inserted a letter from Secretary Benson reviewing the studies now under way and stating, "The objective of our study is to have ready for Congress, when it reconvenes, judgments and recommendations that will be helpful in improving farm legislation." (pp. 11036-7)
40. STORAGE FACILITIES. Sen. Murray asked additional USDA action to make available more wheat-storage facilities (pp. 11037-40).
41. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Griswold inserted a Farm Bureau letter favoring H. R. 3203, the trip-leasing bill (pp. 11049-50).
42. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment H. R. 3956, to provide for conveyance of a tract in the Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex. (p. 11052). This bill will now be sent to the President.
43. TREATY POWERS. Sen. Bricker spoke in support of his resolution to limit treaty powers and criticized the Knowland substitute (pp. 11090-7).

The volunteer groups of public-spirited citizens who are now serving in civil-defense organizations look to the National Government for leadership and coordination of this program and if Congress appears to be indifferent, the morale of those serving on the homefront will be severely impaired. If there is any element of calculated risk involved which justifies the cut in the appropriations, the public should be so informed by the responsible authorities.

We deeply appreciate your expression of interest and your continued efforts to secure adequate funds for civil defense.

Yours very truly,
ARNOLD H. KLENTZ,
*Chairman, Milwaukee Metropolitan
Civil Defense Commission.*

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, following completion of the morning hour, it is proposed to proceed to a call of the calendar, beginning with Order No. 691, House bill 1063, continuing through Order No. 821, House bill 5976, on the first calendar call. Later in the day we may have a call of the remaining bills on the calendar, depending upon what develops.

In addition to that, there are a number of conference reports to be acted upon, including the reports on emergency famine legislation, emergency refugees legislation, farm credit, Mexican farm labor, National Safety Council, and mutual security; and I hope that before the Senate recesses this afternoon there will also be ready a conference report on the supplemental appropriations bill.

We shall have a session of the Senate on Monday next.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Might it be possible, before the calendar call, to take up two motions in connection with noncontroversial matters?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes. I have already discussed that with the minority leader. That has reference to the two bills on which the Senator said a message had come from the House; and it would be agreeable to take those up following conclusion of the morning hour.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO EXPAND CROP-INSURANCE PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1367) to amend section 508 (a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act so as to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to expand the crop-insurance program into additional counties, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 508 (a) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1508 (a)), is amended as follows:

(a) By striking out the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Beginning with crops planted for harvest in 1954, crop insurance may be offered each year in not to exceed 100 counties in addition to the number of counties in which such insurance was

offered in the preceding year. In determining the new counties in which such insurance is to be offered and the commodities to be insured, the Corporation shall take into consideration the demand of farmers for such insurance, the extent to which such insurance is available to commercial producers of insured commodities, and the anticipated risk of loss to the Corporation."

(b) By striking out the period at the end of the next to the last sentence and inserting ", except that insurance may be provided for producers on farms situated in a local producing area bordering on a county with a crop-insurance program."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the amendment adopted by the House provides for extending crop insurance to 100 additional counties this year. The Senate bill was somewhat broader, and would, I think, have permitted extension of crop insurance to about twice that number of counties. However, the Department of Agriculture is making a thorough study of the entire crop-insurance program, and I believe the House amendment will provide for an extension of insurance to as many counties as the Department can get around to for the purpose of extending the insurance this year. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

EMERGENCY FAMINE RELIEF TO FRIENDLY NATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2249) to enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 31, 1953, p. 10992, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the conferees agreed upon substantially all the subject matter of the Senate bill. We agreed to limit the amount to \$100 million which could be used for famine relief, including delivery on board ship. That excludes the use of any Commodity Credit Corporation money for delivery of these commodities overseas; in fact, under the law, that could not be done, anyway. I think the bill has been improved by the conferees, and I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 15) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1 additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit and 2 additional circuit judges for the ninth circuit. In order that the table contained in section 44 (a) of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this section in the number of circuit judges for said circuits, such table is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuits:

Circuits	Number of judges
Fifth-----	Seven
Ninth-----	Nine

SEC. 2. (a) (1) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1 additional district judge for the southern district of California, 1 additional district judge for the district of Colorado, 1 additional district judge for the district of Delaware, 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Florida, 1 additional district judge for the district of Idaho, 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Indiana, 1 additional district judge for the southern district of Indiana, 1 additional district judge for the western district of Kentucky, 1 additional district judge for the district of Massachusetts, 1 additional district judge for the western district of Michigan, 1 additional district judge for the district of New Jersey, 2 additional district judges for the southern district of New York, 1 additional district judge for the northern district of Ohio, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, 1 additional district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Virginia, and 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

(2) The existing judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1083), the existing judgeship for the southern district of Texas created by section 2 (d) of the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges and for other purposes," approved August 3, 1949 (63 Stat. 495), and the existing judgeship for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia, created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia," approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1805), shall be permanent judgeships.

(3) In order that the table contained in section 133 of title 28 of the United States Code will reflect the changes made by this subsection in the number of permanent judgeships for certain districts, such table

87 routine appointments in the Foreign Service.

Due vigilance and care were exercised by the committee on this large number of nominations. At the beginning of the session, the committee adopted a policy of requiring an FBI investigation and report on each nominee to a top job. In addition, all available nominees were interviewed by the committee before it acted on their appointments.

E. CONSULTATION WITH EXECUTIVE BRANCH

This session has seen an even greater use of the system of consultative subcommittees, which are organized to correspond with the organization of the Department of State and which are designed specifically to keep committee members informed of developments in their respective areas and to advise the appropriate policymaking officials of the executive branch.

In order to promote an informal atmosphere in which there can be complete frankness and a free give and take of views and information, the meetings of these subcommittees—usually with the Secretary of State or the appropriate Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary—are kept off the record and no transcript is made. Some of the meetings have been at the Capitol, and some have been in the State Department. In all, 28 have been noted in committee records, and of these, 12 have been meetings of the consultative Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs mainly in connection with problems arising out of the truce negotiations in Korea.

The consultative Subcommittee on Near Eastern and African Affairs has also been particularly active this year, especially in connection with the problem of Arab refugees from Palestine, on which it held a series of public hearings in May and later issued a report.

The full committee has also had a number of consultative or informational meetings not directly concerned with legislation. At the beginning of the session, and before the previous administration left office, Secretary Acheson gave the committee a general review of the world situation with particular emphasis on the December NATO Council meeting in Paris. Secretary Dulles has subsequently met with the full committee four times to discuss important foreign policy questions, in addition to his appearances on special legislation. Assistant Secretary of State Walter S. Robertson reported to the committee on his mission to Korea in connection with the truce negotiations. General Alfred M. Gruenther met with the committee on developments in NATO, and Gen. Omar N. Bradley discussed the world situation generally from a military point of view. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., reported on the United Nations; Mutual Security Director Harold E. Stassen appeared twice (in addition to his testimony on legislation) in connection with problems and policies of the Mutual Security Agency, and Under Secretary Walter Bedell Smith discussed the implications of Stalin's death.

Meetings of this kind proved to be mutually beneficial; the committee received a broader grasp and understanding of the problems facing the United States and the officials received the informal advice and suggestions of the legislative branch.

F. INFORMAL MEETINGS WITH FOREIGN OFFICIALS

As a part of the committee's special efforts to keep itself fully informed on current world developments, there was inaugurated this year a new policy of holding informal meetings with high officials of foreign governments. The committee availed itself of the opportunities presented by the visits of foreign dignitaries to Washington to invite these officials to meet with it and exchange views on an informal basis.

This type of meeting was held with Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of the Federal

Republic of Germany; M. Rene Pleven, French Minister of Defense; Vice President S. Radhakrishnan of India; M. Jean Monnet, President of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community; Mr. Franz Etzel, vice president of the High Authority; and Mr. Dirk Spierenburg, Dutch member of the High Authority.

In the case of the visits of Dr. Adenauer and the officials of the European Coal and Steel Community, transcripts of the conversations were later printed and form documents of lasting historic interest.

The Committee's talks with these distinguished visitors not only gave the committee a better insight into the problems of our friends and allies, but also, I believe, gave these foreign officials a better understanding of our own problems and points of view.

G. COMMITTEE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

The committee has made, or caused to be made under its direction, a number of studies and investigations relating to foreign affairs.

The Subcommittee on Overseas Information Programs held extensive hearings and issued 8 staff studies (3 during the last session of the 82d Congress) and 2 subcommittee reports during this session. That subcommittee's work will continue during the recess with special attention to our information programs in Latin America and to the recent reorganization plan.

The Subcommittee on Security Affairs, established for the first time this year, has issued special studies of the adequacy of United States laws with respect to offenses against national security and of the restrictions on diplomatic personnel by and from the Iron Curtain countries.

The committee has taken steps to revise and bring up to date the study of "Tensions Within the Soviet Union" which was printed as a Senate Document 2 years ago. Work is also in progress on a companion study, "Tensions Within the Soviet Satellites." These two studies, when completed by the Legislative Reference Service, should be particularly useful in view of recent developments within the Soviet bloc.

A number of special committee prints on the mutual security program were issued in connection with the committee's consideration of the bill extending that program. Early in the session, the committee compiled a collection of World War II international agreements and understandings, and work is now in progress on a collection of documents having to do with United Nations and United States policies toward Korea.

H. STATISTICAL SUMMARY

Bills and joint resolutions reported.....	11
(Of which 9 have become public laws or are awaiting President's signature; 1 passed Senate but not House; 1 remains on Senate Calendar.)	
Concurrent and Senate resolutions reported.....	11
Passed Senate.....	11
Concurrent resolutions which passed Senate but not House.....	3
Treaties reported by committee, all of which were approved by Senate.....	23
Nominations reported by committee—all of which were confirmed by Senate (through July 31, 1953).....	170
Committee meetings:	
Full committee.....	102
Public.....	14
Executive later made public.....	30
Executive not printed.....	58
Legislative subcommittees.....	48
Consultative subcommittees.....	28
Conference committee meetings with House.....	6

The committee held hearings on 22 different subjects. In all but 2 of these, the transcripts were printed.

The committee made 24 reports to the Senate, and issued 13 committee prints and 3 Senate documents.

APPEAL FOR ADEQUATE CIVIL DEFENSE FUNDS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared on the subject of Appeal for Adequate Civil Defense Funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPEAL FOR ADEQUATE CIVIL DEFENSE FUNDS

(Statement by Senator WILEY)

I have spoken on many occasions on the need for adequate civil defense funds as a key element in American preparedness.

The appalling weakness of our country on the home front, its dismal vulnerability to enemy attack and to vast casualties is, in my judgment, one of the most serious weaknesses which has ever plagued this Nation.

I note in the July 31 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the compromise appropriations agreed upon in the supplemental appropriation bill for Federal Civil Defense, as recorded on page 11007 of the RECORD.

While this appropriation is not all that it might be, I hope that it will give encouragement to the millions of patriotic Americans enrolled in civil defense programs.

I have in my hand the text of a letter from Mr. Arnold H. Klentz, Chairman of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Civil Defense Commission, a fine group of distinguished citizens who have worked tirelessly on this problem and thanks to whose efforts and others efforts, Milwaukee is among the better prepared cities of this country.

I will have Mr. Klentz's letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

(Board of supervisors, civil defense committee: Frank G. Gregory, chairman; John R. Biemann; George J. Herrmann; Walter F. Hintz; Willard P. Lyons; George W. Carnachan, civil defense coordinator.)

COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE,

OFFICE OF CIVIL DEFENSE,

Milwaukee, Wis., July 30, 1953.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your prompt and encouraging reply to our wire of July 17, 1953. It is also very encouraging to note that on July 27th the Senate Appropriations Committee increased the civil defense appropriations from \$37,770,000 to \$61,150,000.

In the Milwaukee metropolitan area there are approximately 70,000 persons in the civil-defense program. In the Nation there are approximately 4 million. These consist for the most part of employees of local and State governments, and civic-minded volunteers who have taken this obligation as a public service, most of whom serve without any compensation whatever. These constitute a cadre which is capable of expansion in the event of an emergency. Experience has demonstrated the great value of organizations of this type in local disaster situations, and in the event of a national emergency they would constitute the basic organization for defense against atomic, biological and chemical warfare within the continental United States.

Inasmuch as civil defense is an integral part of the national defense plan as outlined by the Federal Government, there exists a need for a strong and continuing leadership in the form of a Federal agency such as the Federal Civil Defense Administration. This agency can function only if adequate funds are provided. Any funds expended to achieve a reasonable and realistic program of civil defense is money well spent in the national interest.

Public Law 216 - 83d Congress
Chapter 349 - 1st Session
S. 2249

AN ACT

All 67 Stat. 476.

To enable the President, during the period ending March 15, 1954, to furnish to peoples friendly to the United States emergency assistance in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to enable the President to furnish emergency assistance on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent relief requirements, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available to the President out of its stocks such agricultural commodities f. o. b. vessels in United States ports as he may request for transfer (1) to any nation friendly to the United States in order to meet famine or other urgent relief requirements of such nation and (2) to friendly but needy populations without regard to the friendliness of their government providing that such commodities will be so distributed as to relieve actual distress among such populations. Not more than \$100,000,000 (including the Corporation's investment in the commodities) shall be expended for all transfers, including delivery on board vessels, under this section. The President may make such transfer through such agencies, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate. Famine relief.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of making payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities disposed of hereunder, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Commodity Credit Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as are equal to the Corporation's investment in such commodities, including handling costs, plus the cost incurred in making deliveries hereunder. Appropriation.

SEC. 3. No programs of assistance shall be undertaken under the authority of this Act after March 15, 1954. Termination date.

Approved August 7, 1953.

